









THE  
PARLIAMENTARY  
REVIEW.

---

NEW SERIES—SESSION OF 1834.

---

VOL. I.

---

EDITED BY  
J. S. BUCKINGHAM, Esq., M. P.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE PROPRIETOR, AND TO BE HAD OF ALL  
BOOKSELLERS IN TOWN AND COUNTRY.

---

MDCCCXXXIV.



THE

# PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1834.

## ON KINGS' SPEECHES IN GENERAL.—AND ON THE LAST KING'S SPEECH IN PARTICULAR.

THE multifarious details connected with the issue of a first Number in a New Series,—added to a most severe and untimely attack of illness, which paralysed all our efforts for several days, arising, it is believed, from that reaction consequent upon the termination of a period of great bodily labour and excessive mental excitement, of which the Recess was so prolific to ourselves, but from which we are now happily recovering,—prevented our giving that degree of attention which we should probably otherwise have bestowed on the King's Speech as a public and political document. It is still, however, in good time; as the Speech will not so soon be forgotten; and we therefore now devote to it that leisure for examination which we had it not before in our power to command.

A stranger or foreigner arriving from a distant land, and wholly unacquainted with our forms of Government, if he should hear of the King being about to meet his Parliament, and address them as to the business of the past and the prospects of the future, would, we think, be likely to come to the following conclusions;—1st, That the King, being at the head of the nation, would, from his education, training, and habits of exercise in the most important business of the state, even though a person of no very brilliant genius or commanding faculties, be very competent to compose a speech, and equally competent to deliver it; and that while reviewing the past, he would carefully avoid praising himself, or those who acted under his immediate directions, but content himself with offering proofs, if any were within his reach, of the soundness of the measures to which the Parliament had given their sanction, as the most gratifying, because the most inefutable, of all eulogies. The stranger would also, we conceive, conclude, that since the only object of adverting to the future at all, would be to show what was most desirable to get done, to point out the mode in which these objects of desire could be attained, and to fix the probable periods of the changes proposed to be introduced, as well as to show wherein the nation would be benefited by their acquiescence in the measures thus recommended for their adoption.

This would be the expectation which reason and common sense would say, the very form of a meeting of the King and the Parliament

VOL. I.—SESSION OF 1834.

would naturally awaken; for without the accomplishment of these rational objects, the meeting itself is worse than a farce—it is a solemn mockery. Let us see, whether the things to be rationally expected have in any degree been realized or not.

In the first place, then, it is *not* the King's Speech that is spoken. His Majesty had no share whatever in the composition of it. It is wholly the work of the Ministers. It is a document drawn up by the collective wisdom of the Cabinet, submitted to its cool deliberations in a morning council first, and then to its warmer discussions at a Cabinet dinner afterwards: preserving, probably, the old practice of our Saxon ancestors, who were said to have had these two periods of deliberation, for tinging the sobriety of their cooler decisions with a little of the warmth of their social revels—or tempering the ardour of these with some of the prudence of their more chastened moments. The Ministers are the composers, the framers, and the writers of the document; and the King is the mere reader of what is put into his hands, for no one statement or sentiment in which he ever held either legally or morally responsible.

Notwithstanding this, however, the writers of the document have no scruple to open down, line after line, the most extravagant praises of themselves, and their whole policy; and then putting the paper into the King's hands, they call upon him to read it as his own, and make him their trumpeter or mouthpiece to proclaim to the world, under the royal authority, what common decency, not to say a becoming sense of modesty, would prevent their saying of themselves in their own names, and under their own responsibility. If this be one of the uses of a Monarch, we can easily understand why those in high places should cling with tenacious fondness to so useful a scape-goat, and so convenient a shield or screen. But it may be a question with others, who are no participators in such advantages, whether it would not be much better that a King's Speech should really be a speech actually composed and spoken by the King, showing *his* particular views as to the past, the present, and the future, and explaining how far he approved of the one, and what he was prepared to support for the other; while the Ministers might, as a body, state *their* concurrence in, or dissent from, any of the measures demanded by public opinion—such as Church Reform, the Corn Laws, and other prominent topics; so that the whole nation might be fairly informed of what were the *real* views of the ruling powers; and then that the two Houses of Parliament, the people, and the press, might each begin their operations with all the advantage of a perfectly clear understanding of the points in debate, and do each their utmost to advance or retard the measures they approved or disapproved, as to each might seem fitting.

For the want of this explicitness, a battle is waged with spectres and shadows, and blows are dealt out without aim or direction. Debate after debate, and question after question, are necessary to understand what it is the Ministers *will* do, and what they will not; when a bold, manly, straightforward avowal of the Prime Minister to both Houses, like the speech of the President of the United States, would save all this quibbling and uncertainty, as well as all the dreadful loss of time. Even when, by worrying night after night, and badgering morning after morning, some confession is extorted as to what the Cabinet is,

# ON KINGS' SPEECHES

and what it is not prepared to do,—the mode, the time, the ~~year~~ of operation, is still kept as secret as possible: the object being apparently to avoid all the tiresome criticisms of the press out of doors, and all the wearying opposition of the reforming members within doors, and to slip the measures through with as little noise, as much rapidity, and as little alteration or amendment as possible.

In the present instance, indeed, Lord Althorp, as one of the parties to whom the framing of the King's Speech was entrusted, admitted that it had been found very inconvenient last year to have said so much in the Speech from the throne, as it left expectations which were not afterwards realized; and therefore it was thought better on the present occasion to say much less, in order to prevent such expectations being raised, and such disappointments following! We believe, indeed, that this sort of prudence is not peculiar to our own Government, but is necessarily engendered by all monarchical institutions, which have a tendency to substitute form and ceremony for spirit and essence, pomp and parade for true dignity, professions for practice, and flattery and insincerity for honest counsel and undisguised truth; and not only to make them desire to have as little said as possible, and call the general silence a proof of public tranquillity, but also to have as little done as possible, and cite the fixed and settled state of things as proofs of general contentment, and the extinction of all restless desire for change. But let us examine this Speech with which his Majesty opened the present Session, and we shall see this love of what is fixed, and aversion to all innovation or change, expressed or implied in the very first sentence; the King being made to say—

"I rely with entire confidence on your firmness in supporting on its *ancient foundations*, and in the *just distribution of its powers*, the ESTABLISHED Constitution of the State."

Such a sentence as this betrays great ignorance or great insincerity on the part of its framers. The ancient foundation of the Constitution gave baronial and feudal privileges to every succeeding age has diminished and taken away :—the distribution of power was formerly made chiefly to strengthen the hands of the monarch and his nobles, with an utter disregard of the mass of the people. If these foundations were good, and this distribution of power just, they never should have been disturbed ; and yet the Ministers are praised in the very Speech that thus eulogizes the *established* Constitution, for having broken in upon it, by the reforms effected, given representatives to places that had none before, taken away nomination boroughs from hands which had held them for centuries, abolished slavery by giving the beginning of freedom to the slaves in the West, and uprooted entirely the great India monopoly in the East. Surely these were all parts of the *ancient* foundations and *established* order of things. They are now happily broken up, and praise be to the hands that have done the work of demolition ; but let us not be called upon to blow hot and cold with the same breath—to praise conservation of ancient usages as a virtue, and yet to praise destruction of existing establishments as a virtue too.

The fifth paragraph is one of the most happy specimens of royal peurility that can be well conceived. It says, in substance, merely this, that "certain Reports are to be laid on the table, which will contain a great deal of useful information, and that they who will take

the trouble to read them will see what they contain, and be enabled to form their judgments on it accordingly;" a truth, no doubt, but one that needed no prophet or royal orator to proclaim.

The four short sentences addressed particularly to the Gentlemen of the House of Commons, are such as would serve for every King's Speech that ever has been, or is ever likely to be delivered to the end of time. It professes a regard for the strictest economy, and at the same time the King is made to say—

"I am confident that I may rely on your enlightened patriotism, and on the cheerful acquiescence of my people, for supplying the means which may be required to uphold the honour of my crown, and the interests of my dominions."

Which, being interpreted plainly, and divested of all its royal obscurity, means simply this—I profess economy in all matters not interfering with the necessary maintenance of the public service; of which necessity, however, the Ministers who frame this Speech are to be the only judges; and I rely on your granting me all the means I ask to keep up the honour of my crown—the splendour of the court, which forms a part of that honour—and the support of all my numerous family, relatives, connections, and dependants.

Let it be always borne in mind that it is the Ministers who write down in the Speech what the King is to say, and that they and they alone are fairly answerable for its fitness or otherwise. But here are some of the items which have been deemed necessary to uphold the dignity of the crown in England.—Paying the debts of profligate minors, contracted in gambling, debauchery, and licentiousness, *because* they were of royal blood; granting a pension to a German prince of 50,000*l.* a year, after the death of his wife, *because* he enjoyed a very brief alliance with royal blood; fixing, by anticipation, a maintenance of 100,000*l.* a year on a German princess, after the demise of her husband, *because* she was, during his life-time, a partner of royal blood; ennobling with peerages, titles, and honours, and supporting by appointments and emoluments, a large illegitimate progeny, *because* they are offshoots of royalty, and allied to the dignity of the crown by half-royal blood at least. Whether the people will *cheerfully acquiesce* in the supply of means, wrung from their hard-earned pittance, for the support of such parts of the "dignity of the crown" as these, remains to be seen; but from the feeling with which they have read the Pension List, and seen women of title and fortune fattening on the royal bounty, while thousands of honest and hard-working men, women, and children, have been exposed to all the perils of hunger, nakedness, and want, and had their last remnant of furniture seized from under them, in distraint for the payment of King's taxes in support of the "honour and dignity of the crown," we should doubt very much whether the Ministers have not deceived the King into a false belief of the approbation of the people, and their willingness to contribute, by the sweat of their brow, to the upholding any longer such honours and such dignities as these.

Again the King is made to assert the twofold fact, that there is great distress among the proprietors of land, and great prosperity among the manufactures. If the former be true, can anything prove more forcibly than that very admission, the utter inutility of all systems of protection, the landowners having been more protected by restrictive and

prohibitive enactments than any other class in the state, till they are now admitted to be the worst off among the whole number. Let them then abandon their prohibitive system, and try the effect of that gradual transition which the manufacturers have made, from a system of protection to one of open competition and fair trade. No, they will not do this; they will require Ministers to do something more, in the way of protection, to relieve them: but no Ministers dare attempt such a step. They may, and they will, probably refuse to do anything for the especial relief of the landed interest, which shall not be equally a benefit to all others. But the Ministers will not be suffered to rest here; the removal of the existing protection for agriculture will be demanded by all who are interested in extending our commerce; and though all three branches of the Legislature are hostile to it now, they will before long be compelled to yield.

The last six paragraphs of the Speech, nearly equal to all the preceding ones, dwell exclusively on Ireland, and most wantonly and injudiciously makes war with a class of men, peculiarly sensitive on the points alluded to, and likely, by the very language in which they are spoken of from the throne, to become greater agitators, and more successful ones than ever. It is, in short, putting weapons into their hands, which they would be greatly wanting in dexterity, if they did not use, and skilfully, against their accusers. But this indiscretion of attributing the distresses of the Irish people to *agitation*, when their poverty and destitution can be clearly traced to causes with which agitation has nothing to do, is trifling compared with the dogged obstinacy with which the King is made to talk of his *fixed* and *unalterable* determination to maintain the Union between England and Ireland, and to denounce all those as excitors to insubordination, who invite the people to discuss this question, and call all those "deluded instruments" who accept the invitation. This is gratuitous insult; and was unbecoming in any Minister to put into the mouth of the King. The Union with Ireland is surely not one of those "*ancient*" foundations of the established Constitution" which the first paragraph of the Speech so earnestly commended to preservation and care. It is an affair of very modern date—not so old, by nearly 200 years, as the East India Monopoly, or West India Slavery, both of which were in their day deemed as inviolable as the Union with Ireland, but both of which are destroyed, and England, far the richer and the stronger for their destruction: not so indissoluble as the Union between Great Britain and her American colonies, which Union has been snapped in sunder, and a native Parliament at Washington doing far better for the Colonists and for ourselves, than our collective wisdom could effect in London: not so old as the alliance between Spain and Portugal, and their Colonies, which has been broken to the advantage of both: and not more binding than the Union between Greece and Turkey, Holland and Belgium, which we have lent our aid to separate, lending money to set up young King Otho on the throne of the one, and placing an English pensioner, King Leopold, on the throne of the other.

• The Union with Ireland!—Is that one of the laws of the Medes and Persians which changeth not? But where are they, and their immutable and unchangeable decrees? Are they not both buried in the dust—where the ruins of Persepolis and Ecbatana, of Babylon and of



Nineveh, speak the folly and madness of all pretensions to infallibility or irrevocable decrees on the part of poor, feeble, transitory man. The Union with Ireland may have been a blessing, or it may have been a curse. But, whichever it may have been, it is an affair as open to discussion as any other that can be named. It was the result of an Act of Parliament—so is the Septennial Bill. And surely each may, with equal justice, be repealed. The Emancipation of the Catholics was for a long time resisted, because it was said the King's Coronation-oath rendered it impossible for him to be a party to such an act. But on the occasion of the late Duke of York rising in his place in Parliament, and declaring that his opinions were hostile to the Catholic claims, and that they always should remain so, unabated and unchanged, so help him God, he was laughed at throughout the country, for pretending to say that he would always continue to be of the same mind. Yet the Ministers make his royal brother, the present King, say what is quite as absurd, that it is his fixed and UNALTERABLE determination to resist the Repeal of the Union, by all the means in his power.

This is as unnecessary as it is sure to be mischievous. The Irish people will press the more for what there seems a predetermination to refuse: and hundreds will be led from this very pertinacity of expression, to doubt whether the Union is really an affair so dangerous to be discussed as they had thought. In a repeal of the Union all sorts of horrors and disasters are foreseen and foretold; a dismemberment of the empire, a cutting off our own right arm, a throwing Ireland away to some foreign conqueror, and making her a prey to her own demagogues, are only a *few* of the evils predicted. But why should any one of these happen, if the Union were dissolved to-morrow? The British empire was not dismembered before the Union, when Ireland had a parliament of its own; it was seized by no foreign power then: and as to its being the prey of demagogues, that is what it is pretended to be now, and it could not be worse in that particular. We have not yet formed any very decided opinion as to whether much benefit would result to either country by the Repeal of the Union; but we candidly confess we cannot see much injury to England or Ireland that would follow. We do not think that either are much benefitted by their connection, and we conceive that the loss of both from the separation would be quite as little were that to be effected immediately. But to denounce its discussion, to say it shall never be assented to, and that the resolution to keep things as they are, is *fixed* and UNALTERABLE, is language wholly unbecoming the monarch of a free people, and as such as the Ministers of England ought therefore never to have placed before the royal tongue for utterance.

But, really, when we see the very men who agitated all England, and accepted the aid of all auxiliaries to agitate more and more for the carrying the Reform Bill, turn round and brand the Irish members with crime, for agitating to effect a Repeal of the Union; when we see the men who cheered on Lord Milton to the declaration of a refusal to pay taxes until the Reform Bill was carried, prosecuting the *True Sun* for having counselled the same thing a year ago, unless the Assessed Taxes were taken off; we know not what to say of confidence in human virtue, or reliance on human professions. It is clear that there is some kind of atmosphere breathed by men when they get into power

which altogether changes their views, feelings, and conduct. But though we cannot perhaps destroy the poisonous effect of the atmosphere entirely, we may do something towards purifying and lessening its destructive properties, by letting in upon it every now and then the strong breeze of popular opinion, and the broad sun-light of popular exposure, which may possibly produce some beneficial effects.

#### ENORMOUS EVIL AND COST OF DRINKING ARDENT SPIRITS.

It cannot be denied that **INTEMPERANCE** is one of the chief causes of poverty, disease, profligacy, and crime.

The cost of distilled spirits to the nation, during the year ending January 5, 1831, was 16,736,712*l.* 10*s.* 8*d.*, without making any calculation for adulteration, the vast quantities smuggled from the continent, or for the millions of gallons illicitly distilled both in Ireland and Scotland.

The amount paid for Poor Rates in England last year was about 8,000,000*l.*, of which three-fourths ought to be charged to the account of Intemperance.

It appears, on unquestionable evidence, that at least one-half of the cases of madness which now exist in this kingdom are distinctly traceable to habits of intemperance. Of 495 patients admitted into the Lunatic Asylum of Liverpool in the course of four years, 257 were known to have had their derangement caused by drinking.

It is shown from the report of the Metropolitan Police that from the 1st of January to the 31st of December, 1831, in the midst of the fearful catalogue of the offences against the law of the land, 31,351 persons were taken into custody on account of drunkenness alone, in the "*Metropolitan Districts*;" that is, in the suburbs of London, without taking any account of the city of London itself.

There were in the course of the same year 95,000 offenders committed to prison in England and Wales; and, by an inquiry instituted in those districts where it was possible to make inquiry, it appears that four-fifths of the crime that has been committed may be traced to habits of drinking.

These statements naturally lead to the inquiry, What amount of benefit results to the community from the vast expenditure of sixteen millions on intoxicating drink? are they healthier, happier, or more prosperous in business? The contrary, alas! is proved by the preceding statement of facts: there is a fearful deterioration of morals, an accumulation of crime, and a great increase of disease and pauperism.

By whom are the eight millions of Poor Rates paid? Not by the intemperate, although by far the greater part of the amount goes for their support. It is the sober, respectable, and industrious classes of the community on whom the burden falls; and who are thus made to support the drunkard and his family, whose means have been wasted in profligacy and dissipation.

Let the reader ask himself whether this state of things should always exist, or whether it is desirable and practicable to effect a change. And, if he think a change is to be desired, let him give a fair and candid examination to the remedy proposed by Temperance Societies.

These institutions are based upon the principle that Intemperance is generated, fostered, and perpetuated by the opinions and practices of the sober and respectable portion of the community; and their object is to effect a union of such individuals in the practice of abstaining from the use of distilled spirits as a customary beverage; and thus, by their united example and influence, attempt to roll back the tide of Intemperance which is now desolating our land. To obtain this object individual co-operation is indispensable.

## SKETCH OF THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULEY, ESQ., LATE MEMBER FOR LEEDS.

---

SINCE Tuesday, the 4th instant, Mr. Macauley has ceased to be a Member of the Commons House of Parliament. On that day a new writ was moved for Leeds, and he, whose voice, heretofore, so eloquently resounded through the walls of St. Stephens, is doubtless now engaged in the inglorious but necessary preparations for a sojourn in another hemisphere, amidst a different race of people, and institutions not the offspring of free men and free minds, but the incidents and results of conquest, and the sharp and unlimited power and dominion of the sword. To his private connexions, the departure of a relative so young, even though buoyant with the highest hopes and the brightest prospects, must be at once painful and melancholy. And though, in the case of constituents and the public, these feelings do not rise up with the same mournful poignancy, still the feeling with which one parts with one whose short Parliamentary career has been so brilliant and graceful, on whom wealth and power seemed so immediately dawning, and whose devotion to the popular cause exhibited a discreet zeal, and an affection tempered with wisdom, cannot be otherwise looked on than painful for the present, however the distant perspective may be tinged with the golden hues of wealth, and fame, and honour.

To a man sinking into the vale of years, after a brilliant yet fruitless career, with hopes that have vanished before his eyes into unreal mockery, and prospects that have been blasted not in the bud but in the blossom—to a man who had heretofore troops “of friends,” now fallen off, or grown lukewarm in the winter of discontent and disappointment, who, with fair aspirations looked to the possession of the sword of State as a thing within the compass of his reach, and who felt that he had the power and the ability to use it well; to such a man, we say, baffled and disappointed, though not disgraced, we can conceive the banishment of a distant government, to come as a sort of splendid exile, and with such feelings, we have no doubt Mr. Canning received the news of his appointment, in 1822, to the high office of Governor General of India, when the life of one more fortunate individual stood between him and the possession of office at home.

Under such circumstances, the individual thus doomed, was but yielding to the imperious necessity of what he looked on as a destiny; and the bruised mind is ready enough at such a moment to supply to itself the salve of a healing unguent. Nor did philosophy refuse her aid to the eminent Statesman, now no more. She told him, no doubt with soothing accents that there is

“Some soul of goodness even in things evil.”

and supplied his poetic mind with images of the instability and uncertainty of human desires and the perishableness of every thing earthly.

Erd baut auf Erde Schöner Von Stein  
Erd sagt zu Erde alles ist mein.

But these consolations are not wanting to Mr. Macauley; for he is not now in the condition in which Mr. Canning then was. The one was in the autumn of life, while the other has scarcely passed the spring-time of existence; the one was married, with a wife and family dependant on him for advancement and distinction—the other is single, and without ties of this kind; the one had been in and out of place with various alternations of fortune—the other, in a short political existence, had occupied a situation of considerable trust and importance, and might soon well aspire to higher and better things; the one had struggled at home with a rival, every way his inferior, and had been on more than one occasion worsted—the other had commenced no struggles of this kind, and his Parliamentary victories had been peaceful and bloodless ones.

The wonder then is, that a man so young, so fortunate, so gifted, one to whom success is so certain, as it would be to Mr. Macauley, consents to renounce those fair occasions of fame and power at home, to travel to a distant land, where health and fame and power may be at once sacrificed, but where, it is true, wealth may be speedily gained. We do not mean to insinuate, much less to assert, that this consideration at all influenced the resolves of Mr. Macauley; far from it; all we mean to convey is, that his election in this matter seems unaccountable to those who judge men by the ordinary rules by which human actions are influenced. It may be that the Ex-Secretary of the Board of Control means to make but a short sojourn in India. It may be that he thinks that continent likely, under the new system, to be the theatre of great events; events that must greatly engage the attention of the British Parliament, and that he is desirous of informing himself on the spot of the part which India is hereafter likely to play in the Political Drama. All this may or may not be true, but although Mr. Macauley's motives be unknown to us, we are, nevertheless, from the character of the man, bound to respect them.

What then is the personal and public history of the Ex-Member for Leeds? Thomas Babington Macauley is now, we believe, in his thirty-sixth or thirty-seventh year. He was born in London, in the year 1797-8; and is the eldest son of Zachariah Macauley, a West Indian and African merchant, of the firm of Macauley and Babington, Mansion-house-Street, City. The father of Mr. Macauley is, we believe, a native of North Britain, and is remarkable for all the sagacity and shrewdness of his countrymen. Nor is he without claim to literary reputation; for we have heard he is the author of several pamphlets and tracts on Negro Slavery, which have been favourably spoken of by the present Lord Chancellor. On the other hand it is alleged, we know not how truly, that for a long period, Mr. Macauley was himself a Slave Owner, and that it was not till he had divested himself of this property, that he began to take an interest in the Emancipation of the Negroes.

Of the early history of Mr. Thomas Babington Macauley we know little or nothing. We are equally ignorant whether he received his school education in Edinburgh or London; all we know for certain is, that he was neither at Eton, Harrow, or Westminster. This, however, is a matter of little moment. A boy of real ability will make progress at any school, however bad; while it may be with equal truth averred

that no school, however good, can do much to forward the progress of a dunce.

Mr. Macauley had, however, made himself generally well informed before he was sent to Cambridge, for while yet without the advantage of being numbered among the children of *Alma Mater*, he had distinguished himself, if we are not misinformed, as an occasional, and very fluent, and well-read speaker at some debating societies held in the city of London. When he was entered of the University he was, we believe, somewhat older than the generality of students for the bar, for which he was destined; and we have not heard that he was particularly distinguished in his academic career. It should never be augured unfavourably of a man from this circumstance. The witliest of modern satirists, and the most useful of Irish political writers—the Hibernian Cobbett—we mean Dean Swift—whose “pure well of English undefiled” had a paramount influence on the destinies of his country, and whose style may be well adopted as a model by those who would unite perspicuity with force—was considered to have exhibited a more than Boeotian dulness at his native University. Nor was that great statesman, from whom Fox said he had learnt more than from all other men and authors—whom Johnson said no man could converse with under a gateway, while sheltering from a shower, without perceiving that he was an extraordinary man—and whose written eloquence comes under the definition of Cicero, *copiosa loquens sapientia*—a man whom Mr. Macauley in one respect resembles in a distant degree, namely, in full and accurate historic learning, and the power of applying it to the subject under discussion—nor was he, we say, particularly distinguished at Trinity College, Dublin. Yet who can doubt that as an orator, a statesman, and political writer, Mr. Burke did not more nearly approach the great Lord Bacon than any man who has lived before or since? Nay, in those fragments of history which he has left to us—too few and too short though they be—in those characters of Alfred and John for example—in that short sketch of Henry the Fourth and the King of Prussia—who can doubt that Mr. Burke was worthy of comparison with the great author of the *Life of Henry the Seventh*? Had we space, or were the occasion fitting, we might multiply these instances a hundred-fold. The brilliant and witty Steele was as little distinguished in his *Alma Mater* as the profound and ponderous Johnson; and the latter, whose knowledge no man can question or deny, obtained his doctor's degree not from Oxford, where he had been unworthily treated, but from Dublin. University honours are, therefore, no tests whatever of general learning or ability, though we should certainly never think the worse of a man because he had attained them. We are aware that this is not the place to enter into a discussion of the system of study and discipline pursued at our English Universities, but we think that the undistinguished career at these great seminaries of those who have become afterwards celebrated in history and in the world, is in a great degree owing to the discipline of the Universities themselves—a discipline which clearly requires alteration. The curious and discursive student will not be tied down and fettered by particular books and branches of learning. He will not exclusively dwell on the subject chalked out for the day, but allow himself to diverge into other paths of learning.

The industrious and curious student will follow the safer maxim of *Age quod agis*, and to this may be attributed his success in his particular and limited sphere. The rays of his intellect converge to one particular point, and in that he excels. This, perhaps, is the safer and better way for ordinary intellects—and of such the mass of mankind is composed—but extraordinary minds, like those of Bacon, Burke, and Johnson, scorn such “one-sidedness” of mind, and divide that attention, which would procure them surpassing pre-eminence in any one study, to a variety of subjects, in all of which they obtain such a mastery as to give a general power. As the Universities only reward particular excellences, it is not therefore surprising that universal or general attainments often, perhaps nearly always, go unrewarded. In the great conflicts and business of life, however, such acquirements are sure, sooner or later, to bring to the possessor an enduring fame; for though he may be surpassed by one gentleman in law, by another in finance, and by a third in historical knowledge, yet his comprehensive knowledge of each of these, and his power of generalizing all of them, will give him a command of his subject, and place him on an eminence from which he may take a survey of it in all its bearings.

In the instance of Mr. Macauley, a new proof is afforded of the truth of this remark. He was not a senior wrangler, as Mr. Justice Alderson, as Mr. Bickersteth, as Mr. Phillimore, or as Mr. Maule; but with all respect for the learning of these gentlemen, and more especially for the varied and rare acquirements of the last—is not Mr. Macauley in public usefulness superior to all of these put together? and does he not exercise a more direct influence on the destinies of his countrymen than any of these gentlemen, or than they can ever hope to exercise? No doubt they may perform, and one of them does enact a high and honourable part in dispensing justice between man and man; but it is in the power of the other as a public man and public orator to add to the treasures of wisdom and eloquence, of which of late in England we have had too few specimens—to increase the sum of human happiness—to influence the mind of the thinking part of the nation—and to achieve those triumphs of reason and eloquence over prejudice and error on which the philanthropist loves to dwell.

While at the University, Mr. Macauley obtained in one matter an envied pre-eminence. There was at that period at Cambridge, and for aught we know to the contrary there may be still, a debating society, composed of such of the students of the University as were willing to become members. This club was called The Union. Like most other spouting clubs of a similar kind, the subscribers discussed general questions connected with history, public economy, politics, and public law. Of this society Mr. Macauley became an early and most distinguished member. He spoke frequently—indeed almost every night of meeting—sometimes at great length—always with remarkable fluency—occasionally with a fervid and impassioned eloquence—and almost uniformly with a knowledge of the subject, and a research beyond his years.

We know that it has been the fashion among some of the old—we wish we could likewise add the wise heads of colleges, to depreciate and decry these societies—we know also that some men who have risen to eminence at the bar, by the mere dint of plodding and plead-

ing, and absolute prostration to the attorneys, have also raised their small voices against them; nay we have heard that these antipathies extended to a part of the bench, and that the Bayleys, the Holroyds, the Gazelees, the Marryats, the Readers, the Comyns, the Platts, and such "small deer," have objected to debating societies *in toto*. Be it so. The fact wears more than the semblance of likelihood; for all these worthy gentlemen have spent the best part of their days in the offices of attorneys and pleaders, and by mere manual dexterity and an exercise of their memories alone, have risen to a bastard and false fame. But this fame is a widely different renown indeed from that of the Lyndhursts and Broughams—of the Denmans and Tindals—of the Parkes and Aldersons—of the Scarletts and Folletts—of the Meriwethers and Talfourds. These men know full well that no one can fulfil perfectly the duties either of a judge or a counsel without that sort of fulness and readiness and general knowledge, and power of communicating that knowledge, which is obtained only by the long practice of debate. And if this colloquial exercise be necessary for the barrister it is no less so for the Member of Parliament. Collectedness, presence of mind, flow of speech, logical arrangement, apt illustration, sarcasm, invective, ridicule, the ability to reply, and the art of guarding, qualifying, and as it were fencing round your positions, all main ingredients to success, either at the bar or in the senate, are scarcely perhaps never attained but by strict discipline and long practice. Never was there a truer aphorism than this: "a poet must be born, and an orator made." All the great speakers in ancient and modern times have laboured hard in private and in public to attain the goal of eminence. Every schoolboy is aware of how Demosthenes toiled and sweated up hill, and by the sea-shore. But why recur to ancient history, when we have so many pregnant examples in our own day? The second Pitt was an assiduous frequenter at debating societies, and has been known to attend at the Court of King's Bench for four successive mornings on a half Guinea motion. Murray, the silver-tongued Mansfield—

So known, so honoured in the House of Lords, practised much both in public and private, and translated from the Greek to improve his diction. Erskine and Curran were both members of several spouting societies; so also were Canning and Mackintosh—Horner (and death too soon stepped between him and more enduring fame) and Brougham were the first founders, and among the most distinguished members of the Speculative debating society of Edinburgh. But a greater and another debater than all these schooled himself into the first parliamentary orator that perhaps ever existed, by reiterated practice. Undismayed by repeated and early failures, he went on small at first and lowly, but he soon ascended the very summits of parliamentary fame, and overcast the splendour of his most brilliant opponents. Mr. Fox attributed his own signal success to his almost nightly practice. During five successive sessions he spoke every night but one, and it was always with him a subject of regret that he did not speak that night too.

In the unreformed Parliament the best general speakers were either men who had entered Parliament very young, and had therefore very long practice, or barristers to whom a certain proficiency in this matter

is a necessary part of their professional education: Croker had been a barrister, a critic, and a *litterateur*. To this and twenty-seven years' practice he owed his success. Tierney had been bred to the bar, and was for forty-five years a Member of Parliament. Creevey had been a barrister and pamphleteer. Peel had twenty-five years' practice as a speaker, first at the university, afterwards in St. Stephen's. Brougham was a writer, a critic, a lawyer, an early spouter at debating clubs, and for twenty years a Member of Parliament. Lushington, Mackintosh, and Cutlar Fergusson had all been barristers, and assiduous attendants at the British Forum and other forensic societies.

In the Reformed Parliament there has been little oratorical talent displayed, and that little chiefly by barristers. A great deal of this lack of ability to speak in the new House of Commons arises, in the instance of the members for towns, from the want of practice, or from that loose habit of declaiming, which men contract who have been schooled at public dinners or county meetings. On these occasions, bold assertion and vehement declamation are the wares most in demand; but these qualifications, however effective in the provinces, unless aided and supported by others of more sterling value, are rather hindrances than helps to the speaker who wishes to command attention in the Commons House. Much also of the paucity of talent in the Reformed Houses arises from the fact of many of the Reformed constituencies having returned, as new members, men who had already passed the grand climacteric.

Among the young speakers who are heard with the greatest attention, the subject of the present Sketch occupies undoubtedly the very first place. And were we to look for a new proof of the advantages of debating societies, the success of Mr. Macauley would furnish us with it. It was the fame of his successes at the Union Club at Cambridge that first made him known. That fame was enhanced by the productions of his pen. During the period of his sojourn at Cambridge he became a regular and constant contributor to *Knight's Quarterly Magazine*, a periodical which exhibited very considerable talent, and certainly deserved a better fate than it met from the "candid and generous public." After a short and fitful existence, and notwithstanding the ability of many of its regular contributors, the *Quarterly Magazine* gave up the ghost. Some of the best papers in this miscellany were from the pen of Mr. Macauley. They are principally historic sketches and tales, for even thus early had our author evinced his passion for history and memoirs, and chiefly for the most attractive of modern memoirs, the French. One of the most interesting of these tales is entitled "The First Love of Henri Quatre," and is founded, if we remember rightly (for it is nearly ten years since we have read it), on the passion of

Ce Roi vaillant, ce déable à quatre,

Qui avait le triple talent

De boire et de battre et d'être un vert galant,

for Fleurette, daughter of the gardener of the Château de Nérac. The admirers of the memory of the resolute, active, and politic prince, a part of whose history is here touched on, and the literary copyists of the ex-member for Leeds, would do well to peruse this early sketch.

Mr. Macauley being, at this period, chiefly dependent on his pen for his daily bread, supplied several articles to the periodicals, some of



which excited the interest of the late Sir James Mackintosh, through whose instrumentality, he at length became a contributor to the *Edinburgh Review*. Many of our readers, not aware of the "secrets of the prison-house," will, doubtless, suppose that, the *Edinburgh Review* is like the London Tavern, open to all the world. No doubt it is, in a certain sense. Any man with a decent coat on his back, may enter the London Tavern; but they only *dine* there who have got hard cash in their breeches-pockets. Just so with the *Edinburgh Review*. Any man who can write good, bad, or indifferent papers, may send his article to this far-famed periodical, but he only who is of the clique, of the craft and corporation of pensmen, will get his production inserted. What hard cash accomplishes in Bishopsgate-street, interest effects with the Whig organ. To all intents and purposes it is a sealed book to the unfriended; and if Samuel Johnson were again to "revisit the glimpses of the moon," and to send to the editor, Mr. Macvey Napier, an anonymous article in his best style, it would not be inserted unless the author had entered the Livery and Common Hall of the Corporation of Criticism, and kissed hands, and done homage at Holland House. To Mr. Macauley, therefore, who had professed at Cambridge, Toryish sentiments, and who had always openly and ably supported the unpopular side of the question at the University Debating Club, the attestation of a pure civism became doubly necessary; and Sir James Mackintosh, seeing the real ability of the man, and dreading perhaps his confirmation in a Radicalism (Mr. Macauley had changed his opinions) more than incipient, for it had now become, not only professed but practical, greatly from real friendship, and partly, no doubt, from the interests of party, consented to become the compurgator of the then obscure law-student, and accordingly he was admitted into the confraternity of the "blue and yellow" periodical. This was best for all parties. The Review and the Reviewers were waxing old and dull. Brougham was rising in his profession, and could neither write so much nor so well as heretofore. Mackintosh himself was indolent and India-livered. Sidney Smith had had some little promotion in the Church, and was like an imprisoned schoolboy set free; for although he wrote better than any man living, yet he always voted the being obliged to do so a great bore. Jeffrey had become jaded and indifferent and disappointed. John Williams was but a casual hand. Frank Allen was slow. Brodie was too stiff and methodical, and not sufficiently spirited. Tooke was too fond of figures of arithmetic; and Parnell too cold, metaphysical, and abstruse. Lord John Russell was too holiday a contributor, and besides he gave to memoirs the gravity of history, and to history the lightness of memoirs. Lord Nugent was by far too playful, and sometimes bolted outright. Lyster had not as yet been long enough in harness; and Lord Holland had been in it a great deal too long. Therefore, for these and many other sufficient reasons, further help and younger blood was required. Accordingly Macauley was admitted one of the firm, and the result was apparent in a series of as brilliant, as learned, and as original pieces, as ever appeared in any country. In truth, the articles entitled *Macchiavelli*, *Milton*, *Herodotus*, *Johnson*, and indeed the whole of the first series of *Historic and Biographic Criticisms*, may be pronounced to have opened a new era in periodical writing. Unhappily they have not been continued. They were evidently composed out of the fulness of a

mind rich in this species of literature; and though their merit obtained for the author the notice of the great, and an introduction to Parliament, yet we cannot help regretting that Mr. Macauley's advancement in the world was contemporaneous with the discontinuance, in a great degree, of the most sparkling and striking style of writing which has yet appeared in England.

We well remember the sensation which the first of these papers occasioned. There were then, as there always are, a whole herd of carpers in full cry: for detraction, and envy, and hatred, and all uncharitableness are the penalties which men must pay for fame; but they who were unbiassed in their judgments and free from that hoarded and sweltering envy, the inseparable concomitant of ignoble and reptile minds, were constrained to allow that the author of the articles in question was no common man. Indeed it was soon apparent that such a writer would in the Commons House be a powerful auxiliary, and much to his honour, the Marquis of Lapsdown seized, in 1830, the earliest opportunity of returning Mr. Macauley to Parliament, for his borough of Calne in the county of Wilts.

We believe Mr. Macauley's first speech was not so decided a triumph as might have been expected by his friends. The House of Commons as then constituted, was a vain and jealous, yet perhaps in the main not an unjust censor. It was composed for the most part of a body of gentlemen keenly alive to the ridiculous, and infinitely more anxious about the tact and taste and *convenances* and manner of a speech, than about its matter or argument. To please such an audience is no easy task. A single word misplaced, a false quantity, a personal allusion, an equivocal sentiment, a bold expression, an abstract truth, a too recondite or pedantic remark, nay, a self-assured air, a triumphant manner, or an argument too logically or subtilely pursued, in the unreformed House, were all motives with some for disrelish, with others for disdain.

In mixed assemblies, like the House of Commons, there is no doubt at bottom a strong sense of justice, and a natural generosity of feeling, but the exhibition of these male virtues may be impeded or wholly checked by the presence of external adjuncts, or the fortuitous misfortune of one's personal appearance or demeanour. In the instance of Mr. Macauley this really was the case. He could not adjust his corporal presence to the *beau ideal* of St. Stephen's Chapel; and, what was still worse, he did not seem over anxious on this point. There was no fastidious punctiliousness in his air—no tremulousness in his manner—a reasonable confidence seemed to lend power to his short, stout, and ungraceful frame, while, regardless of his own unpleasant lisp and the wandering oscillation of his hearers, he went on, sentence after sentence, rising with the dignity of his subject, and acquiring vigour and fluency at the end of each period. For a short time the House was in difficulty. It knew not whether to praise or to condemn, but at length the "Hear, hear" became distinct and audible, and in a little time they formed a chorus cheering and pleasant to the speaker. His eye now beamed with fresh intelligence—his manner became more earnest, vivid, and impassioned—his voice, at first a shrill treble, assumed a fuller and more musical tone, and once fairly in the marrow of his subject, he proceeded smoothly, and

clearly, and logically to the end. The peroration of this speech was its best part. The sentences were short, sharp, and nervous. Each word contained an idea and involved a conclusion. The "Hear, hear" waxed stronger and stronger at each phrase, and at length the Hon. Member sat down, if not in a tempest, at least in a murmur of applause. But the stream soon flowed back to its furrowed channel—the House appeared ashamed to have given way to the weakness of natural sentiment, and soon relapsed into callous indifference. The Hon. Member had not adjusted himself to the "glass of fashion"—he was not knit in the "mould of form." He appeared to wish to be, not the child and subject, but the master and ruler of the House, and this was a dignity which never was accorded without many a hard and well-drawn battle, without alternate victory, and often sad, bitter, and humiliating defeat.

We find the subject grow under our hands, and must therefore break off for the present, to resume and conclude it, in our succeeding Number.

#### THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS.

WHAT is it that distinguishes human society from a brutish herd, but the flourishing of the arts and sciences, the free exercise of wit and reason? What can Government mean, intend, or produce, that is worthy of man, or beneficial to him, as he is a rational creature, besides wisdom, knowledge, virtue, and science? Is it merely, indeed, that we may eat, drink, sleep, sing, and dance, with security, that we choose governors, subject ourselves to their administration, and pay taxes? Take away the arts, religion, knowledge, virtue, (all of which must flourish or sink together) and, in the name of goodness, what is left to us that is worth enjoying or protecting? Yet take away the Liberty of the Press, and we are, all at once, stript of the use of our noblest faculties: our souls themselves are imprisoned in a dark dungeon: we may breathe, but we cannot be said to live.—*Thomson.*

#### PUBLIC SATISFACTION NECESSARY TO THE USEFULNESS OF A JUDGE.

On this occasion, as on all others, popularity is to be considered as a solid and substantial good, unpopularity as a solid and substantial evil, independently of all considerations of good and ill desert. Two properties are indispensable on the part of a magistrate of this sort; that he be a good one, and that he be thought to be so. Without he be so, he will hardly, it is true, be thought so long; but so long as it is possible to be in either case without being in the other, better he should be thought to be good without being so, than be so without being thought so. A judge may be bad in a thousand respects; he may be corrupt or ignorant in the extreme, and yet so long as his corruption or his ignorance do not transpire, no very material suffering may ensue from it: let him be generally thought so, whether he be or be not so is a matter of small moment, otherwise than to his own conscience. An alarm, an opinion of insecurity, equally general, is the necessary consequence; and where there is no opinion of security, as well might there be no justice. Insecurity unapprehended is but a latent source of contingent misfortune to the few; insecurity perceived or supposed is a fund of actual and present uneasiness to the many. Possessing the confidence of the people then, is the first requisite in this line: deserving it, is but a secondary one. This in England is one of the great arguments for juries.—*Bentham.*

## BATTERIES OF ARTILLERY AND AMMUNITION PREPARING AGAINST THE CORN LAWS.

---

THE total absence of all allusion in the King's Speech to the question of the Corn Laws, coupled with the repeated declarations of the Ministers, at various times and in various places, that they have no intention of doing any thing themselves on this subject, must satisfy the most scrupulous that to confide in the good intentions of the Government, and wait their appointed time (which has been the advice usually given by the timid and the wavering), would, in this instance at least, be leaning on a broken reed. The King could not be expected to do any thing; the Lords have every strong motive for not doing any thing; and when it is now seen that the Ministers, and their numerous band of adherents in the Commons, mean to do nothing, it is clear that if the people wish the enjoyment of their undoubted right—a Free Trade in Corn—they must work out this good for themselves.

It must now, we think, be pretty clearly seen, that so far from a man's being a better legislator because he has a large stake in the country, if that stake consists in land, he is by so much the more likely to become a worse legislator for the people than one not so bound by pecuniary interests to keep up the high price of his own commodity at the expense of the commonweal. The subject has been written upon so often, and enforced by such irresistible arguments, in the leading Reviews, Magazines, and Newspapers of the day, as well as in the separate writings of Mr. Maculloch, Colonel Thompson, Colonel Torrens, Lord Fitzwilliam, Mr. Ebenezer Elliott, and a host of others, that one might well despair of being able to say any thing new on a topic so entirely exhausted by those who have gone before. And yet it is clear that enough has not been written, said, or printed, to imbue the public mind with a sufficient degree of conviction as to its importance, or resolution to demand redress; and therefore it is that in various parts of the country (we should be glad to be able to say in all) there are starting up Anti-Corn Law Associations, Anti-Corn Law Magazines, and the whole machinery of a strongly-organized opposition to the further continuance of these odious restrictions on the free importation of human food, popularly known by the name of the Corn Laws. May they go on and multiply until they entirely overspread the land!

As one of the fruits of this wide-spreading spirit, we have just seen a pamphlet put forth by a gentleman of Sheffield, who, to a shrewd understanding, and sound judgment, adds the advantage of large practical experience both as a farmer and a manufacturer; and of whose integrity and disinterestedness no man who knows him can for a moment doubt. The pamphlet is entitled, "Thoughts on the Corn

Laws, proving that they impoverish Farmers by ruining Tradesmen, and without raising the Price of Bread in England, lower it Abroad. By W. Ibbotson." To which is prefixed this most emphatic and scriptural motto :

"He that withholdeth corn, the people shall curse him."—SOLOMON.

We purpose laying before our readers some of the most striking passages of this excellent little tract; and shall then append to it some confirmatory views and arguments of our own. The following are the exposition of his general principles on politics and government with which he opens his work:

It will be admitted by every reasonable member of this great community, that the very end and design of all government should be to afford equal protection to all ranks in society, and as the Almighty is the Father of the spirit of all flesh, and no respecter of persons, so should the government of every country afford equal protection to the person and property of the subject without regard to rank or station.

The great majority of the people of every country live by the fruits of their daily labour, while a small minority subsist on the accumulated labour of others. When a nation is maintained in a state of prosperity, the people will be contented and happy, and if the government do its duty, they will likewise become intelligent and virtuous; but if the country be not prosperous, the labourer will not be contented, and ought not to be so, since, in general, the fault is in the government legislating for the aggrandizement of a few, at the expense of the many.

The labourers always form the bulk and are the bulwark of every nation; and while it is the duty of government to secure to each of its subjects the free and undisturbed possession and enjoyment of his property, it is above all things important, and the first duty of the legislature, to watch carefully and minutely, and to analyze the bearing and probable effect of every measure, so as to prevent the rich and powerful from encroaching upon the just rights of the producer and his labourers.

The history of the world, we venture to assert, cannot furnish one single instance of the labourers seizing upon the property of the rich, until the rich, by exaction and continued oppression, had deprived them of their rights; and, we believe, in all cases of revolution, the blood which has been spilt, was permitted by the Almighty as a punishment, and was nothing more than retrioutive justice.

No country can prosper without a good and wise government; but the danger has always been of that government forming themselves into an oligarchy for the purpose of personal aggrandizement. This has been so common from the days of Nimrod down to the present time, that even good men have been found, who ventured to declare that the people were made for the government, and not the government for the people; and they have even dared to quote Scripture in support of so monstrous an absurdity.

We willingly acknowledge that in all countries and ages of the world, there has been found an immense difference in the relative condition of the people, some being so poor as scarcely to be able to procure the means of a scanty subsistence, while others are so rich as to find it equally difficult satisfactorily to dispose "of their fruits and their goods." But then this has been occasioned solely by the extreme ignorance of the great mass of the people, which always rendered them an easy prey to the craft and cunning of wicked rulers: and, we believe, that in proportion as education is diffused, in the same degree will this evil be corrected.

A desire to be great by making others little, to be powerful at the expense of the weak, has been the rule too frequently with all governments; while to be really great by noble deeds and equal and just laws, and by making the mass of the people virtuous and happy, has been the exception.

In the sight of God all men are equal, and the nearer they approach to an equality of enjoyments in a civil sense, the more will the happiness of the whole be promoted. It must, however, be admitted, that it is the interest of all that an accumulation of labour (in other words, of property) should be allowed and protected; but since it will fall to the lot of very few to be able to procure this, it is of all things important, that it should have no protection from the state which will not most essentially promote the interest of the great bulk of the people, and no man, or number of men, can have any right in property but what the community give to them. This is consistent with both the law of God and common sense; and while we know that Satan can quote Scripture to suit his purpose, we also know that they who often ignorantly do his work, have done so to support a very different theory from ours. Yet, with God's help, and in his name, we will fearlessly meet either party in a case like this, in which the present and eternal happiness of man is so deeply involved.

The class of persons to whom we refer, have talked of "rendering to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," until they have enabled the Cæsars of some ages and countries, to become the greatest robbers the world ever saw, and under a pretence of taking what was their own, they have, in numerous instances, daily taken the food on which the people ought to subsist; and unlike some noble minded robbers, such as Robin Hood, who took from the rich and gave to the poor, this class of plunderers, in all cases, take from the poor many, that they may give to the rich few.

The next portion is occupied in showing that though excessive taxation is one among many of the causes of our present distress, yet that it will not account for agricultural distress, as so small a portion of the taxes is paid by that class; though the author contends that as the National Debt was contracted solely to protect the existing property of the landowners, that property, and not the labour of the manufacturer, or of any other class, ought to bear the entire burden of the interest it has entailed. He says,

If then these wars were undertaken by the landholders of England, in support of what they called legitimacy, when the people of England could not possibly have a voice, or at least a majority in the legislature; if undertaken, as they really were, for the support of monopoly at the expence of labour, surely it will not be denied that the property of the country will be liberally dealt with, if that property have no other tax to pay for the outrage against the common rights of man, than the 800 millions of debt which have been incurred, especially since the poor and oppressed labourers have joined to pay twice as much, that had previously been expended in the same unholy crusade against suffering humanity, and in support of despotism.

We have been led into this line of argument chiefly to meet those advocates of the Corn Monopoly who attempt to justify the measure solely on the ground of our having the interest of such an immense debt to pay. We have endeavoured to prove that the property of the country ought to pay this interest exclusively itself,—and therefore, let us enquire does it do so? We answer no! And we may again safely assert, that the land of Great Britain, so far from paying the whole of this interest, or the chief part of this annual sum of thirty millions, may not, perhaps, in reality, pay one single penny of it.

It is true that landholders and gentlemen farmers contribute as consumers, but the tenants and their labourers forming five millions out of the population of sixteen millions, pay little or nothing, while the manufacturing labourers pay half their wages in the shape of taxes.

It will be remembered, that so soon as the peace of Europe was secured, the landlords of England did as those who carve for themselves are too apt to do—they made a law to exclude foreign corn, or, what was the same thing, they laid a duty upon its importation, which virtually excluded it; and not content with compelling the consumers of corn in England to pay a tax upon all corn which was bought of any grower but themselves, from that day to the present time they have

gradually abolished every tax which directly affected the agriculturist, and, with the exception of malt, hops, tea, and tobacco, the consumption of which has of late years been quite unimportant in the farming districts, they in reality pay nothing. It must be remembered that this one-third of the population of Great Britain is thus freed from taxation, by subsisting principally upon potatoes, bread, butter, cheese, bacon, mutton, and beef, the produce of their own farms, while the labouring mechanic and tradesmen have had their wages and profits reduced in many cases to one half their former amount by the effect of the Corn Laws, and one half of the remainder of their week's earnings is paid in taxes. We believe this will be very generally admitted by those who have studied the subject.

The writer then shows, by detailed statements in figures, the proportions of population and taxation in the two classes of agriculturists and others; and adds:

If, then, these statements be correct, and who can prove them otherwise, what shall be said of the landholders of the country, who, having degraded their fellow-men, by compelling them, in days of ignorance, to spend their blood and treasure in defence of principles inimical to their own interests, and alike at variance with the law of God and common justice, then make a law to compel these very men, and their posterity for ever, to pay the interest of a monstrous debt which, by means of this war, they have contracted, taking especial care to abolish every tax which directly affects themselves; and then, to add to all this, they impose a duty on the importation of bread, the staff of life, in order to raise the price of the only article which they had to sell, so as to free themselves entirely from the payment of one penny towards their own debt. In other words, they make a law to compel every man in the country who does not grow corn himself to buy it of them; and although many of these men talk of competition being the very life and soul of business, they still determine by means of these laws to prevent the possibility of any competitor meeting them in the market.

It must be admitted that they did not deceive the country when they levied this duty on corn as to the motive by which they were actuated, for they plainly stated, that it was done to enable them to pay this debt; and had they really paid it, even recovering, in the extra price of their produce, one half from the rest of the community, moderate men might have made excuses for them; but to tax corn, by which more than thirty millions are annually lost to the country, and do it by measures which so operate, that the best interests of the nation are sacrificed, under a pretence of having this debt to pay themselves: and yet to avoid paying any portion of it, is outrageously wicked and unjust, while the bare recital of such conduct is enough "to rouse a dead man into rage."

The change in the Currency is next adverted to by returning to cash payments, and interdicting the issue of small notes, of which the effect is thus described:

This change so increased the value of money, that all the buildings, tools, stock, and property of the manufacturers of England were reduced 20, 50, and in some instances, even 80 per cent.; by this means, together with the operation of the Corn Laws, profits have been almost annihilated, and the landholders for whose sole benefit foreign corn was excluded, and consequently foreign business greatly diminished, made a law to reduce manufactured goods which they and their households consumed, to one-half the previous price. It may be said that this has been the effect, but that it was not anticipated when the measure was adopted. To this we reply that we know manufacturers who clearly saw and foretold the effect, and not only so, but they made considerable alteration in the arrangement of their business. They closed most of their accounts in England, and sought business in foreign countries, and the distress that has been occasioned by this measure, was just as naturally expected by them, as night is expected when the sun goes down; and if the legislature did not understand what effect this measure would have, they were utterly unfit to govern a great nation; and if they did clearly perceive the natural tendency of this arrangement, and still passed it into a law without adopting measures to equalize its operation, do they not deserve,

according to the law of God and the great charter of our rights, to be punished as if they had been traitors to their country?

But long and serious as this catalogue is, it is not all the mischief which these landlord lawmakers did to the manufacturing population of this country by this currency measure. In general throughout the country, at least in most districts, they have, year after year, continued to exact from the dependent tenant the same amount of rent as they did when money was worth 50 per cent. less, by which five millions of the agricultural population have been reduced to a state of extreme mental and bodily suffering; and, in thousands of instances, to ruin, destitution, pauperism, crime, and unparalleled misery.

In consequence of this, farmers and their labourers being thus almost universally reduced to poverty, they were no longer able to procure manufactured goods, and the manufacturers thereby lost, perhaps, one-half of their country business by the oppressive exactions of these lords of the soil. It is almost needless to say, that the quantity of the circulating money of the country, whether gold, silver, or paper, regulates the price of all commodities, and, therefore, in spite of the Corn Laws, which were intended by those that made them to secure to the tenant such a price for his produce as would prevent the necessity, on their parts, of reducing the rents—still they reckoned without their host, for the oppressions under which the people have groaned, has prevented them from consuming any thing like the usual quantity. The country has had to pay the same amount of interest for the public debt in gold which they paid before in paper, and at a time when wages and profits were frightfully reduced, consequently they have had so much less to spare to buy food.

Then again, owing to distress arising from high rents, the farmers cannot employ so many hands as was usual in former years, and the poor labourers not finding employment, are of necessity driven as paupers to the parish officer, who frequently, in some parts of the country, sell their weekly labour by auction to the highest bidder, a plan nearly as degrading as selling slaves in the West Indies, making up the difference or deficiency of their full weekly allowance out of the parish funds. Such has been the oppressive effect of the poor laws in many parts of the country, that the amount collected in some districts has been more than all the surplus produce of the land.

The consequence of this general poverty among the agricultural classes was the failure of the home market to the manufacturers, on which they formerly relied so much; but when they turned to foreign countries to dispose of those goods they could no longer sell at home, the Corn Laws interfered, as it put them to compete with the manufacturers of other countries, who were supplied with bread at half the English price!

Besides, the foreigner not being able to pay for the goods he wanted, with his superabundant produce, the exchanges were from this circumstance greatly raised, and the price of goods thereby enhanced; and what was still much worse, foreign governments retaliated, and levied large protecting duties on the importation of British goods, until their prices were greatly increased, and consumption proportionably lessened. By such means as these, foreign manufacturers have been encouraged and supported, and have become rival manufacturers, and in many instances, have so far succeeded, that the British manufacturer is entirely cut out, and in all cases his exportation is greatly lessened, while every day that these laws are allowed to continue, either the quantity will still decrease or the price fall.

Had paper money rents been lowered to the standard of 1793, we should have enjoyed continued prosperity, and have cultivated your lands as before. Had Corn Laws not been known, the manufacturer would have been able to compete with the whole world; and his large foreign demand, and the usual demand from home, would, together, have required, perhaps, millions of additional hands, by which means, every labourer in the country would have been fully employed, consumption might have been double what it has been, while crime and immo-



rality, bankruptcy and ruin, would have been comparatively rare, and the whole population would have been prosperous and happy.

It is then shown, by the evidence of the books of an extensive corn dealer in Sheffield, that the prices of flour were higher in 1790 and 1793 than at present; and that the farmer, being then well off, consumed largely of the wares and manufactures of the country; when the author proceeds:

•The low price of corn in New York is entirely owing to the Corn Laws of England; and were those laws abrogated, the first week of the next Session of Parliament, the American market would immediately advance to the same price it was in Mark Lane, deducting the merchant's profit, the interest of the capital, the risk of injury and of the market, the expense of transit, and a commission to the salesman.

The great bulk of the American people grow corn for themselves, and there are not so many buyers in proportion as in England; when therefore the surplus produce is brought into the market the price is so low as only to be just better than nothing. Let as much be shipped to England as would amount to one week's consumption, even that would wonderfully raise the market. The manufacturers of this country do not want corn at a low price, but they want the British market and the continental and American markets equalizing, so that our rivals abroad may not cut us out. They want a free trade in corn to induce foreigners to admit our goods free of duty, and when their markets are brought up to ours, and our goods admitted duty free, we shall fear no competitors in many branches. In others, Corn Laws and high duties have operated so long, and foreign manufacturers have established themselves so completely, that they will, under these circumstances, even meet us in other markets besides their own, let us now make what changes we may.

It requires time for manufacturers to establish themselves in new countries, and, therefore, the injury of this Corn Monopoly, frightful as it has been, we conceive is little in comparison with what it will inflict on England in a few years, were it possible that it should continue so long, and although land owners have been the last to suffer, they will in the end have their full share.

Let us admit American corn, and the relief to the Exchange and Money market would occasion, in that country, a brisk demand for British goods. The tariff duties would be reduced to an amount merely nominal. Profits in England would greatly increase, workmen would be in great demand, and rapidly multiply, and this supply being principally drawn from agricultural districts, the Poor Laws would soon cease to be felt, and the poor, naked, potato-fed Irish, would be welcomed alike by farmers and manufacturers, and invited to partake of the labour, and participate in the benefits of the national prosperity—all the labouring classes would be better fed and clothed—corn would be consumed in much larger quantities—horses, sheep, and cattle would fetch high prices—butchers' meat would advance in proportion—wool and hides would be in great demand for cloth, hats, blankets, shoes, and other comforts and luxuries; and all this might be done without the markets being glutted, provided the abolition was sudden, and speculators had no time given to accumulate stocks, and throw them into the market before the increase in consumption had been properly effected. It must be admitted there are so many contingencies connected with these changes which we have now endeavoured to explain, that no man who is both honest and wise would venture to predict precisely the effect on the markets the first six months, but we will assert that, ultimately, the result would be something like what we have described.

But it may be said, if this is all true, how is it that the legislature of the country are not the first to see it? We are happy to say that many members of the present government do see it, and so do many of the most extensive landholders of the country. Mr. Macauley, Member for Leeds, is reported to have said, that although they might find a majority against Corn Laws in the Commons, yet they could not hope to succeed in the Lords. So then, the millions of the

people of Great Britain ~~are to~~ suffer and pine in want and poverty to please a few weak-minded selfish men, who call themselves Lords, which, by the bye, is a name of all others, which cannot fairly belong to them of all men, surely, since the term Lord means feeders of the people, but the supporters of Corn Laws do their best to starve the population. What then is their proper title?

This is certainly plain-speaking, but not more plain than the subject well justifies. The author shows his title to speak plainly, having been himself a farmer, and having paternal and maternal ancestors living by the plough in the same spot that he now cultivates for two hundred years: he is also a merchant and manufacturer, giving weekly support to upwards of two thousand persons; and were it not for the Corn Laws, he says, he could provide for these two thousand much more abundantly, and give employment to perhaps twice the number of persons. The difficulties in the way of abolishing these laws are clearly perceived by the writer to be in the composition of the two Houses of the Legislature, who have a pecuniary interest, or believe they have, in upholding them. The following passage is sufficiently significant:

We trust whenever the people are again called upon to elect men to watch over the interests in Parliament, that they will select men, not because they are extensive landholders, *but because they are not*. The people of England can do what they please, no power on earth can withstand them. They do not love anarchy, and the weapons they need will not draw blood.—What can fifty or sixty thousand landholders do, with twenty-four millions united in one common cause, marshalled under the banner of justice, and seeking, by peaceful and Christian-like efforts, to recover rights chartered to them by the God of nature and the blood of their ancestors.

We rejoice exceedingly that throughout the United Kingdom some of the most extensive landholders and most noble families are with us, and are sufficiently intelligent to perceive clearly the mischievous effects of these laws—both to the country and themselves. Many of them never disgraced their order by corruption and selfishness, and others have nobly renounced their errors with reference to this question so soon as they perceived their inevitable consequences: and if the country will now come forward, and show a bold and determined front—by making a peaceful and constitutional effort, they will doubtless willingly co-operate, and many of the country gentlemen may thereby be induced seriously to examine the subject, and then we have no doubt of the result. Some there are who appear to live only for the very important purposes of eating, drinking, and sleeping, unless it be to breed and punish poachers, kill game, and ride after foxes, some of these will tell you they are convinced these laws are an evil, but they wish to live quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty, and having no political influence, they can do nothing.

We tell them a property in land can only be held on sufferance in any country, and when landholders form themselves into an oligarchy, and tax labour in order to double the value of land, it becomes an intolerable injury to society, and such a national act is a violation of the spirit, at least, of our charter of liberty.

But we must bring our observations to a close. Had our space permitted, we should have been glad to draw still more largely from the author's pages: though, as it is, some, perhaps, will think we have been sufficiently copious in our extracts. Our object has been to make the more striking parts of the work more generally known; and this object we shall attain, the result of which cannot fail to be satisfactory to the author, beneficial to the public, and pleasing to ourselves. The benevolent writer terminates his appeal in these passages:

In conclusion, we remark, that if the Corn Laws, or any other laws in this realm, were made to benefit one half the population, at the expense of the other half, they would be unjust. What, then, shall we say of these laws, made

the exclusive benefit of fifty or sixty thousand members of the community at the expense of sixteen millions? But this is not the worst of it, for if our statements are correct, and we fear it will not be easy to prove them otherwise, the country loses by the operation of the Corn Laws many pounds for every shilling the landholders pocket; and, if they have any regard for futurity, we have no doubt that they themselves will be the greatest sufferers in the end. But, then, what satisfaction will it be to a man who, after a life of toil and starvation, is at last prematurely laid on the bed of death, even should he be told that his oppressors had all been hung alive in chains to be devoured by birds of prey?

We think neither the merchants, manufacturers, shopkeepers, nor farmers of the country have given this subject due consideration; we, indeed, know some manufacturers that say they understand nothing farther on the subject than this, that in former years, whenever the farmers had good crops, and the produce sold at high prices, they were sure to have a brisk demand in the home market for manufactured goods. We have no doubt this was the case, and will always be so whenever people obtain more money than is required to pay their debts; they then purchase an extra number of necessities; when these have been secured, and the pocket is still well furnished, they procure luxuries; and when extensive profits have been realized, they are expended in property of some kind by which they are diffused all through society. Thus, if every farmer could, annually, a small profit, he would become a better customer to the manufacturer; and could the manufacturer secure profit and afford higher wages, agricultural produce would be more extensively consumed; and so it is that in proportion as one large class in society enjoys prosperity, in the same proportion will it contribute to the prosperity of the other classes. If we could induce the eleven millions who subsist by commerce and mechanical labour, to devote one hour per day, for one week, to the investigation of this important subject, and properly to examine into all its ramifications, we cannot doubt but they would be roused into an effort, when they found it "was for their life." During the last session of Parliament, the people, partly by the number of important subjects which demanded their attention, but particularly by the little notice which their petitions received from the legislature, became quite weary, and many persons, in disgust, declared they would never sign another petition. We entreat such persons to make another effort: you possess no other constitutional means of producing effect but by petition, until the next election, and if you refuse to exercise your privilege on this occasion, you may involve your country in confusion. Were it possible to call forth all the energies of the people, next month, upon this question, it would at once be finally settled, and prosperity would again visit the land with her smiles. Let every man who can open a mouth to eat, use an effort to secure for himself, his children, and his poor neighbour, that which is needful to enable him to meet this first demand of nature.

We shall have frequent occasion to advert to this most important subject during the course of the present Session; and as the space occupied by this article already exceeds that which we had anticipated, we defer to a future number the additional facts and arguments with which we intended to follow this up

#### PERFECT SAFETY OF FREE DISCUSSION.

THOUGH all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously, by licensing, and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew her put to the worse in a free and open encounter?—*Milton's Areopagitica.*

## ON THE NECESSITY OF A COMPLETE AND SEARCHING CHURCH REFORM.

WE broke off from this subject somewhat abruptly, in our last, with a promise that we would renew its consideration in our present Number; and we hasten to redeem our pledge. The question is but now beginning to assume its proper form and shape. Heretofore it was merely a demand that some better distribution should be made of the emoluments within the power of the Church to dispense. Now it is a question whether a State Religion is not in itself an evil, fatal to the growth of true piety and sound morals; and the number of individuals who will take an interest in the discussion of this question will far exceed those who have hitherto manifested an interest in the other; so that we may now expect the whole nation to be enlisted on the one side or the other of this question of Church Reform.

At the first view of the matter one is surprised that the New Testament is so rarely referred to as the standard or example, by the advocates of a State Religion, seeing that if that sacred record contained any warrant for its existence, nothing would be more easy than to point it out. But on a closer examination we shall find that the controversialists exhibit the wisdom of serpents, in keeping as far away from the evidence of the Gospel as possible. The religion of the meek and humble Saviour neither needed nor sought state alliances: on the contrary it abjured them all; and as the Founder of Christianity he emphatically said, "My kingdom is not of this world." He himself neither aimed at wealth, nor possessed it; and his disciples and apostles felt themselves too much imbued with his divine spirit to permit even the zeal of those who would have supplied them amply with this world's goods, to bestow on them any thing beyond passing hospitality and bare subsistence. They laboured with their own hands to minister to their temporal wants, and held "the love of riches" to be, as it is truly characterized, "the root of all evil." If these humble instruments who laid the first foundation-stones of the great and sublime temple of the Christian Faith could be raised from the dead, and introduced into the English House of Lords, to hear the Bench of Bishops defending the sacredness of Church property in tithes, fines, assessments, &c., how would they startle at the solemn assertion of the right reverend fathers in God! that "unless such prizes as incomes of 5000*l.* a year were left in the Church, no *gentlemen* would be disposed to enter it?" We leave the reader to imagine the fire of holy indignation which would burst from the unsealed lips of the apostle of the Hebrews, who so eloquently uttered the memorable denunciation against the high priest of the temple, "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall."

It is time, however, that we should enter upon the remaining portions of the very remarkable exposure of Church frauds and dishonest

translations of the Scriptures, which the pamphlet before us contains; and if its discussion through these pages should extend it, as it will do, much more widely than it could ever have circulated in its original form, we shall consider ourselves as exceedingly fortunate in having it in our power thus to assist in dissipating a delusion so long upheld, and founded upon so evidently fraudulent a mistranslation of a word for the purpose of wresting from Congregations that wholesome power with which the original spirit and practice of Christianity alike invested them, to transfer it by usurpation to a body, in whose hands it has been perverted to the most selfish and interested of all personal purposes, the mere aggrandizement of themselves, and their relatives and dependents. The author, addressing Lord Grey, thus continues:

Your Lordship must, *as a matter of history*, be aware that those who sit in Moses's seat, and who call *themselves the Church*, have perseveringly resisted reformation in every shape, "even though *philosophy, reason, and learning* have (as Mr. Ratcliffe plainly told them), pointed out its blemishes and defects." And therefore that the time predicted by the Bishop of Carlisle, "*when others are obliged to do it for them*," is fully come.

Fortunate it is that this period should have arrived when your Lordship stands at the head of his Majesty's Councils. In other respects, your Lordship has well discerned the signs of the times, and saved this country from a convulsion, by firmly and decidedly saying, "Stand by whilst I, by and through the people, put an end to the Boroughmongering system."

But, my Lord, the Boroughmongering system had an ally (and a powerful one) in the Churchmongering system. Both have stood together, and (God be praised!) there is now a prospect that both will fall together.

I must here beg most particularly to request your Lordship's attention to a quotation in one of those Notes from Jeffrey on Phil. i. 10, (Tracts, Vol. II. p. 347,) where the Bishop says, "that the several schemes of Christianity in different ages are set down in the same place, and so well described, that every common Christian, by perusing them, may easily see *what system he is of*."

And then he adds, "that in order to give a general idea of Jeffrey's method, he will add his principal divisions, as well as the substance delivered under them, from p. 338 and 366, containing as follows:

1. "The *simplicity* of the truth of Christianity in the ages next after the Apostles to St. Augustine, that is, till after A. D. 404.

2. "The rudiments of the *art* of Christianity in the ages following them, that is, between A. D. 404 and 1141.

3. "The *subtlety* and *corruption* of Christianity from Lombard to Luther, joined with the grossness of idolatry and superstition in practice, that is, from A. D. 1141 to 1517.

4. "The reformation of the state of Christianity among some Protestants, from Luther, rejecting the corruptions, (which Mr. Radcliff in his letters to the Bishops in 1773, calls the *outer robe* of pomp and superstition,) but retaining the *art* since 1517, which Mr. Radcliff calls the *inner garment* of artificial theology.

5. "The reformation of the simplicity of Christianity, not only rejecting the *corruptions*; but the *art* also, considering Christianity as a *law or act of grace*."

Jeffrey then observes, "that in the first period of time Christianity was *in its nature and grace*, without any mixture of learning.

"In the second, it was *nature and grace*, with a *tincture* of learning.

"In the third, it was *Church and Sacrament*, with the *extremest subtlety*, and *abundance* of superstition.

“ In the fourth, it was *Christ and faith, being a refinement upon the doctrine of the second period.*”

“ And then Jeffrey makes the following remark, ‘ *In the next period of time, we hope it will be *Piety and Virtue, as in the first, with an improvement from the best Greek and Roman moralists, corrected and perfected by the Gospel.*’ ”*

Is not this, my Lord, a just *criterion* by which (as this Bishop says), “every man may easily see of *what system he is of?*” And may I not presume to add that it is also a just criterion to enable those who live in this fifth period, and to whose lot it may fall to propose reform in religious institutions (as they may become necessary,) to form a correct judgment of the character of the times they live in, and consequently to judge correctly of the nature of the reform then required, in order to realize the *hopes* above expressed, by a return to piety and virtue (as in the first period above mentioned)

I will now proceed to state to your Lordship the ground upon which I assume, that neither can any addition to the efficiency of the Church be attained without a new and *honest translation* of the New Testament, in the place of the present dishonest one. I request your Lordship’s perusal of the following three letters, which were written by the above mentioned author of “*Dissent Justified,*” and which appeared in a periodical paper called the *Old Whig*, about the year 1787.

#### LETTER I.—ON THE WORD CHURCH.

“ Amongst the various *arts* which *corrupt Ecclesiastics* have taken to deceive mankind, there hath been none more successful than their *deceitous* application of the word CHURCH; though *Ecclesia*, rendered CHURCH, denotes any assembly of either men or women, met together, as well on civil as religious accounts. In this sense it is used by *Aristophanes*. In the New Testament, also it signifies an assembly of men met together on *merely civil* purposes, Acts xix. 39. Hence it is applied to the collective body of Christians throughout the world; but *never once* to the Clergy in opposition to the Laity. If this word was always translated CONGREGATION instead of CHURCH, it would appear that the *Authority of the Church*, is nothing more than the *natural power* that resides in the Laity, and the *Rights of the Church* the same with the *Rights of the Christian people*. Had the word been thus rendered, the Clergy would not have been so well able to have *cheated* the people in the scandalous manner they have, under pretence of the *Authority of the Church*. This was perceived by those who had the direction of the Translation of the *English Bible*, they saw that rendering *ECCLÉSIA* Congregation, would destroy the very Foundations of Clerical Authority, and *wickedly* gave this order to the Translators, “*The Old Ecclesiastical Words to be kept; the Word CHURCH NOT to be translated CONGREGATION.*” An Order that could be given for *no other purpose*, but to propagate the notion, and support their pretences of *Ecclesiastical power*.

“ Another instance of the *Integrity* of the Managers of this Translation we find in Acts xiv. 23, *When they had ORDAINED them Elders in every Church, they commended them to the Lord.* The Greek word *Cheirotonesantes*, is rendered by the old *Ecclesiastical* word, ORDAINED, because the Ordination is here supposed to be made by *Paul and Barnabas*, and seems to countenance the *approbation* of Ordination to Clerical men. But they knew this would not hold throughout the New Testament, therefore the same word is made to convey a quite different notion, in 2 Cor. viii. 19. *We have sent with him (Titus) the Brother who was also CHOSEN (Cheirotonesantes ORDAINED) of the Churches to travel with us.* Had these words been rendered, who *was* ORDAINED BY THE CONGREGATIONS; which is the true sense of them, an indifferent reader would have concluded, that originally every Christian Congregation had some share in the Ordination of their own Officers. But there were certain reasons why this should be concealed as a secret from the poor Laity, and why even the Word of God itself should be so rendered as to countenance deception.”

\* See Burnet’s History of the Reformation. Collection of Records, p. 361.

LETTER II.—CONTAINING FURTHER REMARKS ON THE WORD CHURCH, AND ON THE TRUE NATURE OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"As you are an *Old Whig*, you, doubtless, thoroughly understand the nature of our civil, and as a *consistent Protestant* of our Ecclesiastical constitution; I beg, therefore, your assistance for the solution of a difficulty which has sometimes given me, and probably many others, some pain. "I am one of the many Protestants in these realms who am obliged solemnly to acknowledge *his Majesty King George, to be the Supreme Head of the Church of England*. Now I want a determinate and clear idea of that *Church of England* of which the King is the Supreme Head. I shall lay before you my own reasoning on this point, and shall be thankful for your explanation.

"This Church, I apprehend, must be of a very different constitution from that Christian Church of which we read in the New Testament, of which *Christ is the Supreme Head*, for by the constitution of *that*, no monarch nor prince on earth hath any headship or dominion in it; *one only is our Lord*, and all its members, as to matter of authority are put upon an exact level: "*All ye are brethren*." The Church, therefore, I imagine, must be now taken in a *civil* or *political*, not in a *religious* sense, and is not at all to be considered as a Christian Church, or a society of faithful worshippers, but as a merely *political* constitution, a branch of our civil Government, or an entire *part* of the State.

"The word ECCLESIA, Church, is of very indeterminate and various significations; it may be justly applied to any *assembly* or *company*, for whatever purposes called together; yea, when it is a riotous and *confused* assembly, or a company met together for some *pernicious* and *evil* purposes, it is even then an ECCLESIA, a Church, as Psal. xxvi. 9. Acts xix. 32, 41. So that though it is not usual with us to call a society which is only of a *civil* or *trading* nature, a Church, yet according to strictness of language, and the style of the Holy Scriptures, we might very justly, and perhaps with a great deal of beauty and elegance, do it.

"It may seem a little odd to those who are unacquainted with the original language, and who are not quite divested of that tincture of superstition which custom or education have given us more or less, and who are not accustomed to bring things to the strict test of Scripture and reason, to such it may seem a little odd to talk of the *South-sea* or the *India Church*, or the Church of the *Gracers*, *Fishmongers*, &c. But yet such a *Trading Company*, assembled and incorporate for mercantile ends, are in strictness of speech, a Church, and much better deserve the honour which is usually connected with that title than some other societies who appropriate it to themselves, such, for instance, as the Church of Rome.

"The Church of Rome, I apprehend, is as really a political or a trading society as the *India* or the *South-sea*. It is a society formed upon political and worldly maxims, for prosecuting worldly ends. The whole hierarchy is an artful and well-concerted scheme for the acquiring grandeur and wealth, and there is as much a *trade* carried on by these ecclesiastical merchants, a trade for worldly goods, as by the *African*, the *Turkey*, or any of the mercantile companies of that city. It is thus beautifully represented by the Spirit of God himself, Rev. xviii. 11. 'And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her (*i. e.* spiritual Babylon or Rome) for no man buyeth her merchandise any more. The merchandise of gold, silver, and *souls* of men.' See the allusion elegantly continued throughout the whole chapter. The Pope is governor of this great trading company or Church; the Cardinals and Bishops are the chief managers and *directors* of it; the Priests and inferior orders are the *shipmasters* sent forth into all parts of the earth with their pretended spiritual merchandise to *traffic* for silver, gold, power, &c. The waters upon which their ships are sent out are *People, and Multitudes, and Nations, and Tongues*, Rev. xvii. 19. Amongst whom they go forth, and vending their corrupt wares, bring grandeur and wealth into the sacred treasury, the Church.

"Their traffic to those kingdoms, through the mercy of Heaven, was by the Reformation cut off. There arose amongst us a sturdy Prince (Hen. VIII.) who not bearing to see the nation drained and impoverished by these spiritual merchants, prohibited their wares, and stopped the channel of their trade. But as the people were madly bent upon the holy trinkets they sold, he found himself obliged, as his interest and ambition also strongly inclined him, to set up a manufacture of the same nature in his own realms. By this there were two valuable ends obtained.—1. Our home-made wares were much better and more refined than what had been imported to us from abroad.—2. Our power and wealth were partly kept amongst ourselves, and however stupidly profuse the people were in their purchases of these toys, yet the nation was not robbed, and it was much more for the honour and interest of Britons to be choused and peeled by merchants of their own, than by crafty knaves of a foreign breed.

"Henceforward then we are to consider this great trading company, the Church of Rome, as having lost a very profitable and important branch of its commerce, called the Church of England. Our brave and bold King no longer brooking to be a kind of *factor* to the proud company at Rome, throws off their yoke and sets up for himself. The Governorship or *Supremacy* which was before lodged in the Pope, he took from his Holiness and annexed to his crown; for thus the statute, 26 Hen. 8th, c. 1, enacts, 'That the Kings of this Realm shall be taken and accepted as the only Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England, and shall have and enjoy the honours, profits, commodities, &c., belonging to the Supreme Head, and shall have full power to visit, reform, order, correct, restrain, amend all such errors, heresies, &c., whatsoever, which by any manner of Spiritual authority or jurisdiction may be lawfully reformed, corrected, &c.' In consequence of which the Kings and Queens of England have taken on them to enact laws, to prescribe articles, to decide controversies of faith; authoritatively to judge what is, and what is not agreeable to the Word of God; to forbid all preaching for a time, and when they gave their ministers leave to preach, to limit them to certain articles, and tell them *what* they should preach. The Bishops and Priests and all other officers in the Church of England, are properly the Ministers and officers of the King. It is from him, the *Head* of this body politic, they derive all their spirit and power to act, as much as any officers of the Army or Excise."—See *Cranmer's Minutes of the Meeting of the Divines at Windsor*.

"The Church is his *property*, and he, together with his great council the Parliament, can new model and change all or any part of it, or even *destroy the whole*; can abolish all the present ceremonies and appoint an hundred new ones in their stead; can command its Bishops and Priests to *believe*, to *subscribe*, to *preach* what doctrines he please, Calvinism, Arminianism, Arianism, Trithoism, Transubstantiation, Judaism, Mahometanism, and no doubt would find Bishops and Priests to believe and preach as their Supreme head shall direct. He has power to excommunicate from, or admit to this *His Church*, independent of, yea, in opposition to the Bishops and Clergy, can revoke the Spiritual censures of Archbishops and Bishops, yea, can excommunicate, suspend, or deprive *even themselves*.

"Now from all this it seems natural to conclude that the Church of England, of which the King is acknowledged the Supreme Head, is not to be considered as a RELIGIOUS, but as merely a *political or civil society*, as a Company incorporate, partly for the preservation of order and peace amongst the people, who like the Jewish Christians of old could not bear to be stripped at once of all their pageantry and religious pomp, but *principally* for the maintaining in ease and grandeur its officers and clergy, and for the pouring in the great and good things of this world on them. That this Church is in its constitution vastly different from *that Religious Society or Scriptural Church* of which Jesus Christ is the Head; that it is built upon a different *foundation*, formed with different views, has different *Laws, Ministers, Members, Terms of Admission*, and *Rejection* from it, might easily be shewn; and indeed the honour of our constitution, the good of our country, and the instruction of our fellow-subjects seem to call on us to show it.



"But I cannot conclude without observing with a mixture of wonder and mirth,—the what shall I call it?—Delicacy of sense; they cannot in conscience call any separate congregations Churches; no, they are but *Conventicles*, and they can give them no better name; yea, the Church of Scotland or of Geneva, is language not to be allowed, because they have no bishops. But pass over into Italy, and there you have true Churches; the Church of Rome is good language; they have Bishops and a Supreme Head after the model of the Church of England, and this will compensate for all its other gross defects. Why are we thus complaisant to our bitter, and relentless enemies abroad, but so shy and reserved to our brethren at home? This is hardly *consistent Protestantism*, nor agreeable to the generous and brave spirit of an Old Whig."

We must stop here, though much remains to be added. We feel assured, however, that we have quoted sufficiently from the pages of the work under consideration, to satisfy the most bigoted adherent of the Church, and the most determined advocate for things as they are, that a case is here made out which demands inquiry; and that if the allegations now put forth as to the fraud practised in the translation of the word *Ecclesia* as Church, instead of *Congregation*, cannot be disproved, it is high time that a revision of the whole system should take place; for to go back to the original meaning of the first founders of Christianity, and to vest all the power now enjoyed by the clergy of the State Establishment in the whole of Christian congregations, would be to effect a much greater revolution in the Church than that caused by the Reformation under Henry the Eighth, or than any other change which has taken place in ecclesiastical affairs since the first establishment of Christianity itself. We shall return to this subject again, as, so far from being exhausted, it is but just beginning, as the bishops and prelates will soon find out to their cost.

#### AMBITION.

AMBITION is to the mind what the cap is to the falcon: it *blinds* us first, and then compels us to tower by reason of our blindness. But alas! when we are at the summit of a vain ambition, we are also at the *depth* of real misery. We are placed where time cannot improve, but must *impair* us; where chance and change cannot befriend but may betray us; in short, by attaining all we wish, and gaining all we want, we have only reached a pinnacle where we have nothing to hope, but every thing to fear.—*Lacon*.

#### EFFECTS OF THE CORN LAWS.

MR. CRAWFURD proved, at the late Crown and Anchor meeting, that the daily labourer is taxed 20 per cent. on his income for bread, whereas the upper and middle classes are not taxed above 5 per cent. He further showed a loss upon our exports of manufacture to the north of Europe, amounting to not less than 30 per cent. from the year 1817 to 1830. He proved that the same quantity of corn which costs at Amsterdam 42,000,000*l.*, cannot be had in London for less than 79,000,000*l.*; and lastly, that the produce of the taxes on foreign produce, actually paid by the people of this country to bolster up the agricultural interest, exceeds 7,000,000*l.* sterling. One almost shudders at the iniquity of such legislation—a system which none but barbarians would adopt, and none but slaves would, with their eyes open, submit to.—*Times*.

## COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CHARGES AGAINST THE IRISH MEMBERS.

---

As we anticipated in our last, the result of a second discussion of this affair has been the appointment of a Committee to examine into the charges made, and report their opinion thereon to the House. After the matter was once brought before it, and at all entered upon, this was the only course which could be safely taken, though we regretted from the first that the Legislative Assembly of the country should ever have been chosen as the place for such a discussion at all.

This question occupied the whole of the evening on Monday, and the House, after the appointment of the Committee, adjourned at eight o'clock; so that this topic, which we think ought never to have been introduced to the House at all, has now been the only one that has excited any public interest, or received any public attention during the whole of the time that Parliament has yet been assembled.

We do not think it necessary to give the whole of the speeches that were delivered on this occasion; but we make such a selection of the most important portions of each as will enable our readers to form their own judgment on the question, to which we hope we shall not have occasion again to advert until the decision of the Committee shall come before us, which we hope will be soon, when we shall publish its Report.

The SPEAKER called on Mr. O'Connell; but Mr. Sheil rose, and advancing to the table, said, that before his hon. and learned friend proceeded with the motion of which he had given notice, he would entreat the house to extend its indulgence to him for a few seconds. ("Hear, hear," from all parts of the house.) He assured the house that he had no intention of interfering with the discussion that might arise on the question, lest he should, by any ill-considered expression, wound the feelings of any individual in the house; but he took the opportunity of repeating, with the simple strenuousness of one whose conscience was pure, that he was innocent of the charge imputed to him. He had no wish to take any part in the debate but he earnestly called for a full and complete investigation. The course to be pursued in conducting that investigation he left to the wisdom of the house: he submitted his cause to their decision; he left his fate in their hands; and he threw himself with a perfect confidence in the result on British generosity and good faith (hear, hear); but he did hope that in entering upon inquiry all spirit of partisanship would be laid aside (hear, hear); and that the tone of acrimony which had betrayed itself a few days back would not be again exhibited. The temper and feeling with which the remarks to which he alluded had been given might not have been intended to pain him (Mr. Sheil), but it was impossible not to complain of their severity. In conclusion, he threw himself entirely on the candour and justice of the house. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. STANLEY had certainly not wished on a former occasion to say anything that could wound the feelings of the hon. and learned member (Mr. Sheil); the subject was of a nature so delicate that it was next to impossible to say any thing on the subject without giving pain; he only wished that an inquiry should take place, because the honour of the house was concerned in the possibility of stain on the honour of one of its members, and it had been his wish to state that

possibility in the most tender terms. (Hear.) As it was then the intention of hon. members to sift the charge to the bottom, it was the more important to know distinctly what the charge was which was to be rebutted. The hon. and learned member for Dublin was, he saw, prepared to go into the whole of the details of the case, and he intended, he (Mr. Stanley) presumed, to lay before the house the grounds on which the charge rested.

Mr. O'CONNELL.—I do.

Mr. STANLEY would say that the merits of the question reposed not so much on naked facts, as they depended on the views entertained, and the answers given by the hon. and learned member for Tipperary. The statement which had been made was, that the hon. and learned member had used language out of the house which was at variance with his declared and avowed sentiments in it. He wished to know whether the hon. and learned member had viewed the charge in that light, and whether he was to be understood as resting his denial on the statement thus made?

Mr. O'CONNELL objected on the part of his hon. and learned friend that he should be induced by any means whatever to make any reply to such a question. It was what he thought a most insidious attempt to shew the real merits of the question, and he gave no credit to the right hon. Secretary for the Colonies for motives which had brought him forward. He had himself come forward on that evening with a greater distinctness of purpose than he had before entertained. The delay which had been interposed had been attended by two advantages; one was, that the house could now approach the discussion with calmer feelings; the other, that he had had time to make up his mind to the infinite difference between the statements of the noble lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), and those of the hon. member for Hull. (Hear, hear.) No two things in the world could be more different. In the hurry of the occasion, and perhaps owing in some measure to the suddenness with which the charge was made, he had for the moment confounded the two charges. But he then clearly discerned how very different they were. One involved what he would certainly call a serious crime, and one which it would be hardly proper to examine into in that house; the other was not of a nature so serious, but still one which should be set at rest one way or the other. This was the charge which the noble lord had volunteered to lay at the hon. and learned member's door; he said volunteered—at any rate he had adopted, sanctioned, and justified it. On a former occasion he had stated that he acquitted the hon. member for Hull of stating what he was unable to prove, but he felt he had been too hasty in making such an admission. For his own part, he would enter upon the discussion in the absence, as far as he was concerned, of anything like personal feeling; he would strive to banish from his mind every motive of hostility, every impulse of passion and excitement. (Hear, hear.) The publication in which the speech of the hon. member for Hull was reported contained an allegation on the part of the hon. member which he challenged him to justify. Let the hon. member create in the minds of others the belief which he himself entertained, or let him retract the injurious expressions of which he had been the author. It was his (Mr. O'Connell's) intention to make the report of the hon. member's speech the ground of a distinct motion on a breach of privilege. This was important, that they might know at what rate they were to appreciate the value of character. (Hear, hear.)

The speech, as reported, had the advantage of appearing in the first person; perhaps that was to enhance its interest with the public, and if it could be proved that that was the only intention, he thought much stress ought not to be laid on that circumstance. But he (Mr. Hill) had not denied that the report was a true one, and he would not only have to show that he believed the charge, but to satisfy the house that it was well-founded. The hon. member had not when applied to by Irish members, even softened the expressions which had been attributed to him, and by not doing this he had, in fact, acknowledged the accuracy of the report. The hon. member then proceeded to read the following passage from the *Examiner*:—"It is impossible for those not actually in the house to know all the secret machinery by which votes are obtained. I happen to know this (and I could appeal, if necessary, to a person well known and much respected by your-

selves), that an Irish member, who spoke with great violence against every part of the bill, and voted against every clause of it, went to Ministers and said, 'Don't bate one single atom of that bill, or it will be impossible for any man to live in Ireland.' 'What!' said they, 'this from you, who speak and vote against the bill?' 'Yes,' he replied, 'that is necessary; because, if I don't come into Parliament for Ireland, I must be out altogether, and that I don't choose.' (Hear, hear.) If any conversation upon which such a charge could be founded had actually occurred, it could only have been in implied confidence—it was not necessary for one of the parties to say to the other "Do not tell." The informer, when he did show himself, would come before the public with a moral tarnish, and it would be felt that a man who could be base enough to violate confidence was capable of inventing the calumny. The house had it in their power to prevent the worthy person whom the noble lord believed, and whom he (Mr. O'Connell) utterly disbelieved, from being brought forward: they might prevent his name and address from being known; but the melancholy consequence would be, that many honourable men who were utterly incapable of the turpitude of repeating private conversation would be stigmatized as the culprit. Many a man of honour who would shrink from the offence would be believed to be the talebearer. (Hear.) He had heard many persons named as the authors of the scandal. With respect to some of them he disbelieved the rumour, and with respect to others he entertained doubts. If inquiry should be stifled, it could only be for the purpose of enabling the guilty to escape.

He brought the question forward on the present occasion in perfect good humour, and he now wished to know to what extent the hon. member for Hull meant to carry his charge, and whether he was ready, as he said the other day, to come forward with proof? The course he proposed to pursue was to move for the appointment of a committee of privileges, and if that motion should be acceded to, he would refer the *Examiner* newspaper to the committee, and propose that the inquiry should be as extensive as possible. With respect to the tale told by the noble lord, he really knew not how to deal with it. The noble lord had repeated some tittle-tattle on his responsibility—he had inflicted a wound, and it was for him to give up his authority, in order that the charge might be substantiated against the guilty, if there were any such, and that the innocent might be relieved from all suspicion. The names he had selected for the committee were above all reproach—they were gentlemen not one of whom was connected with the Irish party of which he had the high honour to be the leader. "He" said the hon. member, "how busy the voice of calumny has been with us (the Irish members). When the Channel separates us, and you cannot assail us yourselves, you set your tongues loose upon us." He scorned, however, to notice such attacks. His hon. and learned friend had struggled with him for twenty-five years—struggled with small means in defence of the great principle of the freedom of conscience. No man during that period adorned and animated the contest with half the eloquence, power, and sterling patriotism exhibited by his hon. friend, and if he could have been diverted from his course, there was no doubt that with his splendid talents he might long since have been exalted to a situation in which he would have deserved the curses, but received the full pay of his country. (Hear, hear.) Nothing, however, that could occur should divert him (Mr. O'Connell) and his hon. friends from the course which they had taken. He came before that house to demand a full and fair inquiry,—such an inquiry as the hon. member for Hull said he would be prepared to support. The hon. member concluded by moving that a committee of privileges should be appointed, adding, that if the motion should be agreed to, he would propose the following members for the committee:—Lord Granville Somerset, Sir F. Burdett, Colonel Maberly, Colonel Evans, Mr. Russell, Mr. Hume, Mr. Hawkins, Sir H. Hardinge, Mr. Gillon, Major Fancourt, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Warburton, Mr. Grote, and Mr. Parrott.

The passage in the *Examiner* newspaper of the 10th of November, 1833, was then read by the clerk.

Mr. HILD said that the hon. and learned member who had just addressed the house, had expressed a wish that the subject should be discussed with temper.

For his (Mr. Hill's) part he would answer that it should be discussed with even temper. As far as possible he would follow the precept of the hon. and learned member, and neglect his example. He begged at the outset to call the attention of the house to what occurred on Wednesday last. It would be recollected that after the noble Chancellor of the Exchequer declared that some members of Parliament had used language with respect to the Coercive Bill out of the house, completely at variance with that which they had employed in the house, without his (Mr. Hill's) uttering a single word or exclamation, the hon. and learned member for Dublin rose, and in terms which he at the time thought most sincere and handsome, stated that he (Mr. Hill) was perfectly justified in every thing which he had said. The hon. member now stated in words that he did not withdraw the retraction which he then made. Did the hon. member mean to tell him so in fact? What was he to make of his speech? If it was not a withdrawal of his retraction, was it not an attempt to explain it away? Did he (Mr. Hill) not now, in the opinion of the hon. member, stand perfectly justified in every thing which the newspapers had represented him to have said at Hull? ("Oh!" and a laugh.) Was he to have the hon. member's retraction or not? Did the hon. member withdraw that retraction or did he not? (Hear, hear.) He would have either one thing or the other; he would not accept half a retraction. Let there be a full retraction or none. Let not the house mistake him. He did not affect to suppose that when the hon. member stated on Wednesday that he (Mr. Hill) was perfectly justified in what he had said, that therefore the hon. member meant to admit the truth of what he had said, as applied to a member of that house; he merely understood the hon. member to mean, that whether right or wrong, whether accurate or mistaken, he (Mr. Hill) was sincere in what he had said at Hull—that he firmly believed the story, and, believing, merely repeated it. That he understood the hon. member to say now. Was that the meaning of his words, or had they any other meaning? He would thank the hon. member for something to which he could fix him. (Hear, hear.) Was he (Mr. Hill) called upon to defend his veracity or his want of caution? Was the question whether an Irish member had done what he (Mr. Hill) had charged him with, or whether he (Mr. Hill) had done what the hon. member for Dublin had charged him with in two letters to his constituents, when he let loose the Irish press against him (cheers)—namely, invented and fabricated the story? He wished to know how the question stood—whether it was with respect to the charge of his having fabricated the story, or with respect to the truth or error of the story itself? He received no reply, and he would now proceed to prove the case, first as regarded himself. The hon. member for Dublin, in a letter to his (Mr. Hill's) constituents, said, in the most distinct terms, "This man invented and fabricated the statement." He wished to know how the hon. member found out that he had fabricated the statement? What evidence could the hon. member have upon that point? And he asked the hon. member—accomplished as he was in casuistry—whether there was any practical moral difference between him who asserts that which he does not know to be true and him who asserts that which he does know to be false? (Hear, hear.) How could the hon. member know the statement was false? How could he know that it was a fabrication? There were only two individuals on earth who stood in such relation to each other as would enable either of them to say that a statement made by the other was a fabrication, and they were the Siamese twins. (A laugh.) Thank God, he and the hon. member were not twins of that description. ("Hear," and a laugh.)

He would leave the case there—he would appeal to the house whether, when he addressed his constituents in October, 1833, the fact which he stated—be it true or false—was not known to hundreds of members of that house. He would prove that at the time the hon. member for Dublin accused him of having fabricated the charge he knew it had been made months before. He held in his hand a letter, which he would not read to the house, simply because it was too long, addressed to him (Mr. Hill) by an hon. member, and published in an Irish newspaper called the *Corr. Evening Herald*, for the avowed purpose of answering him on account of the statement he had made. The letter was dated

November 17, 1833, and the writer was Mr. Fergus O'Connor. The censure which the letter contained was severe, but it was frank and straightforward, and he never for one moment entertained any ill feeling towards the gentleman who thought proper to write it. In this letter Mr. O'Connor copied, almost sentence by sentence, the report of his (Mr. Hill's) statement, which had been read at the table, and therefore it was evident he had the charge before him, and knew what it was. Mr. O'Connor then mentioned a gentleman's name, which he (Mr. Hill) had never mentioned, for this simple reason, that he had never been asked for it (hear), as that of the person who was stated to have made the declaration to Ministers, and added "that he heard the slander from a member in the house, and solemnly declared that if he could recollect his name he would publish it." Mr. O'Connor added that he disbelieved the statement at the time it was made. The purpose, for which he (Mr. Hill) mentioned the circumstance was not to show that the statement was true, but that it had been made. It was clear that the statement, true or false, had been made to Mr. O'Connor months before he repeated it. On the 28th of November, long after the publication of Mr. O'Connor's letter, the hon. and learned member for Dublin attended a dinner at a place called Clondalkin, in the neighbourhood of Dublin, on which occasion he thought proper to take notice of the letter published by the hon. member for the county of Cork (Mr. O'Connor), by stating that "an unwise friend had published one of the most foolish letters he had ever read (a laugh), in which he named his hon. and learned friend as the person pointed at in the speech at Hull, but that it was little short of an act of insanity to connect his hon. and learned friend with such a transaction." He (Mr. Hill) was not saying that it was not,—he was delivering no opinion of that sort; he merely referred to the letter to show that, on the 28th of November, the hon. and learned member for Dublin knew that some months before the hon. member for the county of Cork was acquainted with the charge which he repeated at Hull. Would the house, then, believe, that on the 8th of December the hon. member for Dublin, after having had time to consider the matter, wrote a second letter to his (Mr. Hill's) constituents, in which he uses these words:—"I have before charged the hon. member for Hull with having fabricated this statement—he has made no answer to the charge; I reiterate, that he has fabricated the statement, and he does not promise to answer the charge?" He (Mr. Hill) thought he had proved, when the hon. member for Dublin reiterated the charge that he had fabricated the statement; he knew that a gentleman, whose veracity he could not controvert, had stated that he had heard the statement in the House of Commons many months before. The charge of fabrication has been answered by the hon. member for Cork, whom he would not, in imitation of the hon. member for Dublin, presume to call foolish. (A laugh.) If, however, that vindication of himself had not appeared, he would have waited with perfect patience until the meeting of Parliament afforded him an opportunity of addressing the house, because he knew that there he should be believed—at least to this extent—that he was incapable of stating any thing which he did not believe to be true. He felt that he should be believed by every person who knew him. (Hear.) He knew, further, that he should be believed by every man who knew the hon. member for Dublin, and that was a large class. ("Hear," and laughter.)

The hon. member for Dublin complained that he had not entered into a newspaper controversy with him. He was not in the habit of entering into a controversy of that nature with any persons, and certainly, the hon. member was the last person with respect to whom he would be induced to infract the rule which he had prescribed to himself upon this point. He had not the presumption to consider himself equal to the hon. member in the display of skill with which he favoured the public. The hon. member's talent for invective and vituperation was unparalleled (a laugh); and he did not choose to enter into a contest in which he knew beforehand that he should be worsted. Besides, why should he do so? The fictions which the hon. member for Dublin for a moment deceived himself into believing were too monstrous to require refutation. They generally answered themselves. They were perishable commodities. The hon. member should throw more of the alloy of truth into them if he wished them to wear well.

("Hear," and laughter.) In the present case the hon. member had refuted himself with his charges followed by retraction, and the retraction nibbled away in order to set up the charges again. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member now said, that when he made the retraction he was taken by surprise—that he really thought when the noble lord on the treasury bench made his statement, that it was in substance the same as his (Mr. Hill's), and that therefore, acting on the impulse of the moment, he made an ample apology, and offered to repeat it out of the house. It seemed that he was undeceived by the speech which had fallen from the right hon. Secretary for the Colonies, but as that speech was delivered on Thursday, why did not the hon. member then withdraw his retraction? The conduct of the hon. member was calculated to excite only one feeling in his mind. He would not be betrayed into any warmth of expression—there was one reason why he should be cautious in this respect—the house, in the exercise of its discretion, had bound his hands, and whenever that took place, either by his own act or the act of others, he thought it was but just that he should put his tongue and his pen under equal restraint. (Cheers.) The hon. member had done him no more than justice in saying that he desired inquiry. It was his wish that a complete investigation might take place. He had felt it due to the house and to himself to state at the earliest possible moment what, as far as his recollection went, was the substance of what he said at Hull. He said that the speech he delivered upon that occasion was unpremeditated, and spoken under adverse circumstances. It was delivered on the 22d of October, and his attention was not drawn to its importance until the publication in the *Examiner* on the 10th of November. The hon. member for Dublin said that the matter was then brought under his (Mr. Hill's) attention; so it was, and as soon as he was aware of the excitement it had created, and the pain it had caused to gentlemen on the other side of the Channel, he adopted what appeared under the circumstances to be the best course he could pursue—namely, he publicly announced that he would state who was the individual alluded to, if he would apply to him. That being the case, he could not understand why the hon. member for Dublin should taunt and defy him. What had he done in the matter, that he should be made the subject of taunt and defiance? Now that he was placed in a situation where his motives could not be misconstrued, he did not hesitate to say that he deeply regretted that he made the statement, whether the circumstance referred to in it was right or wrong. (Hear, hear.)

He had never until now had an opportunity of making that declaration—he had never been met in a spirit of candour and justice. The first notice which was taken of his statement was in terms of abuse, insult, and defiance. Under these circumstances, it was impossible that he could make the slightest concession. He regretted that he had made the statement—first, on account of the pain and distress which it had occasioned him; and, secondly, because of the pain and trouble it had given to others to whom the charge could not apply. A considerable period had elapsed before his attention was first directed to his speech at Hull, and another interval had since intervened. Speaking only from recollection, he believed that he did not utter the passage contained in the report relative to "secret machinery;" and his opinion on that point derived confirmation from the fact that the passage had no connexion with what followed. He never meant to make a charge against Ministers, and therefore it was unlikely he would have made use of the language imputed to him. He was quite ready, if the house required him to do so, to repeat every particular of what he had stated on a former evening. The hon. member for Dublin called upon him to bring forward a charge. He had stated, to the best of his recollection, the substance of what he said at Hull, and he was not aware that he could be expected to do more, unless he was expected to become the public prosecutor, and to draw up an indictment, and then he would wish to know whether it was to be on paper or parchment. He asked whether, in the judgment of the house, there had been any want of explicitness on his part? If the house thought that he ought to retire, and draw out a statement in writing, to be laid on the table, he would comply with their wishes, but otherwise he would not do more than he had done on Wednesday—namely, state the substance of what he had said at Hull. (Cries of "State, state.") Unless called upon by the

house, he would make no further statement. If hon. members had forgotten what he said on Wednesday, they might refer to the reports of the debates in that house. ("State, state.") He rose for the purpose of seconding the motion for the appointment of a committee to inquire into all the circumstances of the case. It was his most anxious wish that a committee should be appointed. That it would report in one way he entertained a very strong opinion; but the member to whom he had alluded, and had never yet called upon him, by himself, to name him, was entitled to inquiry if he chose to ask for it there could be no doubt, and he was sure that no person in the house would be better pleased than himself if the inquiry should terminate in the full acquittal of that hon. person, and in the conviction that he (Mr. Hill) had been misinformed, in common with the noble Chancellor of the Exchequer and others. (Hear, hear.)

MR. H. GRATTAN said, the hon. and learned member for Hull had not answered the argument of the hon. and learned member for Dublin, neither had he answered that made by the noble lord, which certainly was very different from his in some of its most important features. The hon. and learned gentleman had said, he would be cool in his address to the house, but he (Mr. Grattan) would leave the house to judge of that coolness. It was that sort of coolness alluded to in the words—*Tu pulsas, ego vapulo ignitum*. But the charge, as far as it was meant to affect his hon. and learned friend (Mr. Sheil), was utterly destitute of foundation. He had acted with his hon. and learned friend in opposition to the Coercion Bill, and he could state from his own knowledge, that as well in his private conversations as in public, it had his most decided and determined opposition. (Hear, hear.) If some runner or spy were, by raking up private conversation, and turning it into his own meaning, allowed to lay the foundation of charges of this description, what public man could say he was safe from imputation? (Hear, hear.) The charge was a most solemn and serious one, and the hon. and learned member in whose speech it first transpired was bound to prove it, as he had stated it at Hull. His statement was that an Irish member, who had spoken violently and voted against the Coercion Bill, had gone to, or communicated with, a Minister, and urged him to pass that very measure to which he was thus publicly opposed. The hon. gentleman next complained of the manner in which his hon. and learned friend (Mr. Sheil) had been attacked in and out of that house, and added, that since the time of the tax coalition there had not been any instance of such an attempt to run a man down. (Hear, hear.) But the attempt would totally fail. It was an attempt to run a man down in the estimation, first, of his constituents, and then of the country at large. The constituents of his hon. and learned friend were too well convinced of the value of his great services, and of his honest and independent principles, to be led away by such an absurd charge as this; but, absurd as it was, it involved consequences too important to be allowed to rest where it was. The answer of the noble lord (Althorp), which went beyond what he was asked, threw a degree of responsibility on him which he could not shake off without giving the name of his informant, for he not only said that he had such information, but also that he believed it. He was, of course, bound in justice to prove what he had thus said. The charge, by including "more than one" Irish member, cast an imputation over a large body of them, and the people of Ireland would not be satisfied that such a charge should be allowed to remain without inquiry, affecting, as it did, the character of as honest a body of representatives as had ever sat in that house. (Hear, hear.) Under these circumstances he should give his cordial support to the motion, because it would afford the only means which seemed now left to explain what he must term as gross a charge as had ever been made.

SIR F. BURDETT expressed his deep regret that this case had been suffered to occupy the house as it had done, and he could not see any other effect which it could produce on the public mind but that of involving its own degradation. (Hear, hear.) He did not see how it was to go farther with it, or in what way the question of privilege could arise, or how this committee which was moved for was to act, or in what way its authority was to be exercised, or how it was to proceed. As far as the hon. and learned member for Tipperary was concerned, he did not see that there was any thing in the case to touch him (hear, hear), for



he (Sir F. Burdett) should be ashamed of himself if he did not solemnly declare his entire belief in that hon. and learned gentleman's asseveration of his innocence. (Loud cries of "Hear" from several members at both sides.) He would repeat that he did not know in what way the committee were to proceed in the matter. The charge had now dwindled away, it had shrunk like a phantom, and eluded the grasp. (Hear, hear.) For his own part, he did not see how the committee were to collect the information that might be desired. Suppose, for instance, he were called upon to repeat what had transpired in private conversation; he would say that he had a peculiar defect in his memory, so that he could not recollect what any man said to him in his private conversation (hear, hear); and if private conversation was not to be detailed, on what was it that they were to proceed? Might it not happen to any public man to give a strong opinion in private on a particular measure, and afterwards, on more mature consideration, to vote differently from what he had said? (Hear, hear.) For his own part, he could say that it had often happened to him to give his vote in that house differently from the impressions made on him at first by it, and which impressions he had expressed in private as they first arose in his mind, but he did not think that in so doing he had been guilty of any direktion of honourable principle, or of any political inconsistency. In the present case, the charge (as we understood the hon. baronet), was a calumny, or it was a story repeated from private conversation, but he did not think that matters taken from private conversation ought to be made the ground of a public charge amongst gentlemen. (Hear, hear.) What took place in the discussions on the reform question, particularly in former Parliaments, when the majorities against the measure were very great, and when the anti-reformers were making great exertions, and a firm stand against the progress of the question? Why, it was a common thing to taunt hon. members who supported the measure, and say "That is not your own private opinion; you speak from intimidation, and are afraid to avow what you think;" but he had never understood that by any such language a charge was meant to be conveyed that the party so alluded to was guilty of any direktion of public principle. He himself had often voted for measures which but for their being connected with some other important object he would never have sanctioned—measures for which, if taken in the abstract, no consideration could induce him to vote, and he did not conceive that in so doing he violated any honest or independent principle. It was, he admitted, a most painful thing for any man to have an imputation cast upon him, however unfounded it might turn out to be. It was well known how a charge of any kind, when once made, got on; and that a suspicion was considered to attach, when a man was called on to answer any charge, no matter how unfounded; but in the present case, he thought that the charge made was already fully answered. There was, in fact, no accuser, and there was nothing which, in his opinion, a committee of inquiry could go upon. For himself, he would repeat that he was perfectly satisfied with the asseveration of the hon. and learned member for Tipperary. (Hear, hear.) He hoped that the house was equally satisfied, and that it would see the necessity of going on with the public business. With these feelings he would now move as an amendment, that "the house do proceed to the order of the day."

Speeches were afterwards made by Mr. G. Sinclair, Sir Henry Willoughby, Mr. Stanley, and Sir Robert Peel, but nothing new or important was elicited by them; and at the end Mr. O'Connell made a short reply; when a division took place, and the numbers were, for granting the committee, 192; against it, 54. Leaving a majority in favour of the committee of 138. The names of the committee will be found in a subsequent page.

## PENSION OF PRINCE LEOPOLD, THE PRESENT KING OF BELGIUM.

---

THIS subject was brought before the House of Commons on Tuesday evening, on the motion of Mr. Robinson, for a return of the sums of money paid into the Exchequer by the trustees of King Leopold, who were charged with the appropriation of his pension. The facts elicited furnish a striking commentary on the extravagance, and may we not add, on the selfishness engendered by excessive wealth and elevation of station. Prince Leopold was, as is well known, a young German prince; of neither fortune nor power, who being on a visit to the Court of England, attracted the attention of the Princess Charlotte, and, responding to her feelings of attachment, married her, and made a most exemplary and affectionate husband. That such a person as the consort of the king's daughter, should have asked or received any allowance from the public funds of such an overtaxed country as this, was neither honourable to the prince or his father-in-law, and was an injustice done to a nation whose debts and engagements weigh it to the ground. If the married couple were happy in each other's affections—and there is every reason to believe that they were pre-eminently so—the allowance already enjoyed by the princess, as one of the royal family, would have been abundantly sufficient to have maintained them in all becoming dignity; but even if that were not sufficient, there were many offices either in the civil or military department of government, for which he might have been considered eligible; and while discharging the duties of some one of these, he might have benefited his country, and handsomely supported himself, without recourse to the public funds, except as one receiving the fair wages of services faithfully rendered. Instead of this, a most unnecessary and extravagant pension of 50,000*l.* a year is granted to an individual who gives no service in return, and who has no other claim to this reward than that he is the favoured choice of the Princess Charlotte for a husband—a piece of good fortune already sufficient, one would have supposed, for an individual placed in such previously adverse circumstances—but on whom there was not the least necessity for heaping up further honours by the lavish grant conferred.

Instead, however, of this sum, large as it was, having effected the intended object of placing Prince Leopold beyond the reach of difficulty or embarrassment, he became speedily as much in debt as if he had received no marriage portion whatever. After a very few months, his royal consort dies, lamented, and deservedly so, by the whole nation, and mourned over sincerely, no doubt, by her husband. He continues a widower for many years, having no necessary state, and no large family to maintain; when, in the course of events, he is selected to fill the throne of Belgium, and preside over a rebel state, revolting from her allegiance to Holland, and establishing herself on the broad democratic and republican principle, that every nation and people have a right to dethrone their old governors and set up new, or separate

from their former allegiance altogether, and establish a government of their own, whenever the majority of the people feel dissatisfied enough and strong enough to effect their object with certainty. The public attention, was, of course, soon raised to the question of whether the time had not arrived for the relinquishment of this pension of 50,000*l.* a year, now that Prince Leopold was about to become the dependent monarch of an independent people; and it was while this question was strongly agitating the public mind, that the following letter was addressed by the Prince to Earl Grey, as principal Minister of State.

“Marlborough-house, July 15, 1831.”

“My dear Lord Grey,

“Before I quit the country, I am desirous to state, in writing, the intentions and views which I had the pleasure of communicating to you verbally this morning, on the subject of my British annuity.

“As Sovereign of Belgium it is not my intention to draw from this country any portion of the income which was settled upon me by act of Parliament at the period of my marriage. Your Lordship is, however, well aware that up to the very moment of my leaving England I have maintained my establishments here upon their accustomed footing, and that, consequently, there remain to be fulfilled and discharged pecuniary engagements, and outstanding debts, to an amount which it is quite impossible for me to state at the present time with precision. As soon, therefore, as I shall have accomplished the payment of these demands, it is my intention to make over, into the hands of trustees, whom I will without loss of time appoint, the whole of the annuity which I receive from this country, in trust for the following purposes:—

“I shall require my trustees to maintain, in a state of complete habitation and of repair, the house, gardens, and park, at Claremont; and further, to pay all the salaries, pensions, and allowances, which I shall deem a proper reward to those persons who have claims upon me for their faithful services during my residence in this country. I shall, in addition, require them to continue all those charities, and annual donations to charitable institutions, which have been allowed or subscribed to, either by the Princess Charlotte or by myself, up to the present period.

“All these objects having been fulfilled, it is my wish and desire that the remainder shall be repaid into the British Exchequer. I remain, my dear Lord Grey, most faithfully yours,

“LEOPOLD.”

The apparent generosity of this act, and the seemingly reasonable reservations that were made in the letter, obtained for the Prince loud eulogies at the time. But this admiration gradually cooled, as it came to be known, that though upwards of a million sterling had been received by the Prince in this pension, not a single shilling of the surplus had ever yet found its way into the Exchequer. This led Mr. Robinson, the member for Worcester, to move, on Tuesday last, for an account of its appropriation, in which motion he was seconded by Mr. Guest; and as the whole defence of Prince Leopold's conduct is contained in the reply of Lord Althorp to the motion in question, we give it entire.

Lord ALTHORP said that he did not intend to object to the motion, but at the same time, after what had passed, it was necessary this he should offer a few observations to the house. The hon. member had said that Prince Leopold was supposed, during his residence in this country to have been a man careful of his money; but the hon. member must be aware that, without being guilty of extravagance, his Royal Highness might, from the circumstance of making a purchase, or from other causes, have exceeded his income. The amount of Prince Leopold's

incumbrances was not known at the time he wrote the letter to Earl Grey, and in consequence of that circumstance the persons whom he had nominated as trustees refused to act, and up to the present time there were, in fact, no acting trustees. Previous to the meeting of Parliament he had received two letters on this subject from Baron de Stockmar, the private secretary to the King of the Belgians. These letters were dated the 2d of February last, and were as follow :—

“ Marlborough-house, Feb. 2. ”

“ My Lord,

“ In addition to the letter which I have had the honour of addressing to your Lordship this day, I think it proper to direct your attention to the circumstance that the amount of His Majesty the King of the Belgians's pecuniary engagements and out-standing debts, due at the time of his quitting this country, could not, as His Majesty then stated to Earl Grey, be ascertained with precision. They have been found to amount to nearly 83,000*l*. The current expenses of Claremont, Marlborough-house, and the other payments referred to in His Majesty's letter to Earl Grey, amount to nearly 20,000*l*. per annum, which two items will account for the application of all the sums accruing from His Majesty's annuity since his departure from this country. With regard to the annual payments last noticed, they will in future be met under the trust created by His Majesty, and will be reduced in amount at the expiration of the lease of Marlborough-house in 1835, and by other contingencies, such as the death of annuitants, and the probable diminution in the expenditure for repairs.

“ How far this communication may be considered requisite on my part, according to the spirit of the letter under which His Majesty's income in this country has been, and is to be, appropriated, I submit entirely to your Lordship's better judgment; and I have the honour to subscribe myself your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

“ Baron de STOCKMAR.”

“ Marlborough House, Feb. 2.

“ My Lord,

“ I am commanded by His Majesty the King of the Belgians to inform your lordship, that the pecuniary engagements and outstanding debts of His Majesty in this country are nearly liquidated, and will be entirely so on the 5th of April next; and that after paying the sum yet remaining to be discharged out of the April quarter, and providing for the necessary expenditure until the ensuing quarter becomes payable, according to His Majesty's communication to Earl Grey previous to his quitting this country, there will be a large surplus, which will be paid into the Exchequer in the course of the month of April.

“ It has been already communicated to your lordship that in August, 1832, His Majesty was anxious to place the income under the controul of the trustees, but that they declined beginning to act in the trust until His Majesty's private affairs in this country had been entirely settled.

“ As the sum remaining to be liquidated can be now ascertained, it is my intention to address His Majesty's trustees to induce them immediately to enter upon the trust; but should they decline to do so until all the incumbrances are discharged, that is to say, until after the 5th of April next, your lordship may be assured that the first payment into the Exchequer will be made in April next, and from that period no impediment will exist to the trustees commencing their trust.

“ I have the honour to subscribe myself, my Lord, your obedient and humble servant,

“ Baron de STOCKMAR,

“ Controller and Private Secretary.

The hon. member had alluded to some reports, which had never before come to his (Lord Althorp's) knowledge, to the effect, he imagined, that some part of the annuity had been spent abroad. If such rumours existed, he was happy that they had been brought to his notice, because it afforded him the opportunity of

stating, that as far as his knowledge extended, they were totally destitute of foundation. The letters which he had read to the house accounted for the appropriation of nearly the whole of the sum which had been paid in the name of His Majesty since his departure from this country. With respect to His Majesty's right to the annuity, it was clearly established by act of Parliament. Those who recollected the circumstances under which the annuity was granted must be aware that if the idea had been thrown out that Prince Leopold ought not to retain the annuity after the unfortunate event which subsequently occurred, it would have been scouted. The conduct of Prince Leopold during the lifetime of his wife, and since her decease, had been such as to command the respect of all men, and he was sure the house would not sanction the proposal to deprive him of his annuity, particularly after he had voluntarily surrendered all except such portion as was necessary to fulfil the objects which he had stated in his letter to Earl Grey. The hon. member did not object to the appropriation of a part of the annuity to charitable purposes and the pensioning of servants, and surely it was very natural that the King of the Belgians should desire to maintain the establishment at Claremont. In conclusion, he hoped that the trustees appointed by His Majesty would now consent to act, and that in consequence of the arrangements referred to in the Baron de Stockmar's letter, a considerable sum would soon be paid into the Exchequer. (Hear.)

This, then, is the whole case; and we must say, that when we regard Prince Leopold in his new character of King of the Belgians, by whom he is munificently paid—when we add to this the recollection that he has since married the daughter of one of the wealthiest sovereigns in Europe, Louis-Philippe, the King of the French, and that in his prudent care for the future, he has received a large marriage-portion with her—it does seem to us altogether unjustifiable in him to draw, or in the government of this country to continue to pay, a shilling of such pension, while there is a single honest and industrious family in England wanting bread. To keep up the deceased Princess's contributions to charitable institutions, to maintain all her old servants, and to support the house and gardens at Claremont as they were during her lifetime, might be very proper and praiseworthy, if it were done from any private fortune of the deceased Princess, or any independent sources of her since-married lord. But to continue a pension of 50,000*l.* a year, on the pretence of first paying all these charges and then handing over the surplus to the public treasury, is a recognition of Prince Leopold's right to deal with the whole according to his will. We think that by far the more dignified course for him would be to relinquish all claim or title to it whatever; and if he had not the virtue to offgate such a relinquishment, we think it is the duty of His Majesty's ministers to press this on his serious and immediate attention.

#### CALUMNY.

CALUMNY on the part of the candidate is a tribute of acknowledgments paid to the virtue of the elector. "It is because you mean to give your vote to the most deserving, that I take all this pains to make you believe my antagonist is not he." The man who canvasses with a bribe in his hand, or upon his table, may give his indolence from a deal of trouble, and his candour and veracity from a deal of danger: the strength of his cause lies not in the plausibility of his pretensions, but in the goodness of his liquor, or in the heaviness of his purse.—*Bentham.*

## COMMITTEE TO DEVISE SOME PLAN OF OBTAINING CORRECT LISTS OF DIVISIONS.

It will be remembered by many of our readers that this is a subject to which I frequently endeavoured to draw the attention of the public during the last session. Towards its close Mr. D. W. Harvey, the member for Colchester, made a specific motion on the subject, which was opposed by Lord Althorp, and others of the Ministry, and lost in a division. It has been taken up this session by Mr. Ward, the member of St. Albans, to whom Lord Althorp has offered no opposition; and accordingly on Tuesday last, a committee was appointed to consider of some plan by which the Divisions may be taken with the greatest accuracy, and the lists receive the sanction of the Speaker before they go forth to the public.

We are exceedingly glad of this result, which will effect a great change in the conduct of many members. Heretofore it was impossible to do more than publish the names of the minority, that being the party who had always, during the present Parliament, to go out into the lobby, while the majority remained in; and the names of the minority were taken down on the outside on cards or slips of paper, and collected by some one individual who sent the list to the papers; but of the majority who remained within, no account was even attempted, and there was no means of doing so without some regulation of the House. As the representatives of the people are sent up to Parliament for the purpose of voting rather than speaking (as *all* can do the former, though to many the latter is neither agreeable nor practicable), the regulations ought to enforce the record of the vote of every Member on every Question that is put to a division. All should be obliged to declare themselves either for, or against, or absent, and then the constituencies would have some grounds on which to judge of the conduct of their members.

We shall watch the progress of the measure with great interest, and do our best to give the plan resolved upon, whatever it may be, our best aid to make it as practically effective as possible.

## COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

### ELECTION EXPENSES.

Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the expenses charged by Returning Officers at the Election of Members for Counties and Boroughs in England and Wales, Scotland and Ireland, at the last general Election, and also to inquire into all other expenses attendant on the Registration of Votes, and at the Election, with the view of fixing an uniform rate of charge."

Mr. Hume	Sir Wm. Molesworth	Mr. Guest	The Lord Advocate
Lord John Russell	Mr. Hall	Mr. Clay	Mr. James Oswald
Mr. Shaw Lefevre	Mr. Aylshford Sanford	Mr. Walter	Mr. O'Dwyer
Mr. R. Wallace	Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Tennyson	Mr. Thomas Wallace
Mr. Jervis	Lord Viscount Forster	Mr. Tooke	Mr. Crattan
Sir Edward Knatchbull	Mr. Aglionby	Sir Rufane Donkin	Mr. Ruthven
Mr. Bonham Carter	Mr. Spring Rice	Mr. Goring	Mr. Blake
Sir Ronald Fergusson	Mr. Middleton	Mr. Godson	Sir Hen. Willoughby
Mr. Ewart	Mr. Murray	Mr. Gillon	
Mr. Telfair	Mr. Harvey	Mr. Sinclair	

## MEDICAL EDUCATION.

Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into and consider of the laws, regulations, and usages, regarding the education and practice of the various branches of the Medical Profession in the United Kingdom."

Mr. Warburton	Mr. Bannerman	Mr. Clay	Mr. Gillon
Lord Vis. Howick	Mr. Andw. Johnston	Mr. Robert Clive	Mr. Sinclair
The Lord Advocate	Mr. Halford	Mr. Ewart	Mr. Baldwin
Mr. Littleton	Mr. Frankland Lewis	Mr. Peter	Lord Oxmantown
Sir Robert Inglis	Mr. Hawes	Mr. Strutt	Mr. Serjeant Perrin
Mr. Goulburn	Mr. O'Connell	Mr. Edward Romilly	Mr. Jephson
Mr. Shaw	Mr. Spring Rice	Mr. W. Whitmore	
Mr. Abercromby	Sir Robert Peel	Mr. George Wood	
Mr. James Oswald	Mr. Hume	Mr. Ord	

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the best mode of securing an accurate and authentic account of the Divisions in this House, and to report their opinion thereon to the House."

Mr. Ward	Sir Ronald Fergusson	Mr. Benett	Mr. Harvey
Lord Visc. Althorp	Mr. Hume	Mr. O'Connor Don	Mr. Tooke
Sir Robert Peel	Marquis of Chandos	Mr. O'Connell	Mr. Aglionby
Sir Robert Inglis	Mr. Warburton	Mr. Clay	
Mr. Grote	Mr. E. John Stanley	Sir John Sebright	
Mr. Hawes	Col. Leith Hay	Mr. Bonham Carter	

## CASE OF THE IRISH MEMBERS.

Lord G. Somerset	Mr. Romilly	Mr. Gillon	Sir Robert Peel
Sir F. Burdett	Col. Verner	Major Fancourt	Mr. Abercromby
Sir E. Knatchbull	Mr. Hawkins	Mr. Shaw Lefevre	Mr. Strutt
Col. Maberley	Mr. Shaw of Dublin	Mr. Warburton	
Sir H. Harding	Mr. Hume	Mr. Grote	
Mr. D. O'Connell	Mr. H. Tynte, jun.	Mr. Parrott	

## OBJECTIONS TO LAWYERS BEING EMPLOYED IN THE WORK OF LAW REFORM.

SIR,

Hull, Feb. 11, 1834.

As our Law Reformers proceed so slowly, I am inclined to believe that we shall never have a complete Law Reform until all men connected with the learned profession, as they call themselves, be excluded from the committees or commissions for improving the laws. Let this important subject be entrusted to well-educated and intelligent men, who have no interest in the laws being ambiguous and expensive.

Lawyers are about as likely to reform the laws as the bishops are to purify the church of its abominations, and to make it a Christian institution again.

I am, Sir, Yours Respectfully,  
S. J.

## ADDITIONAL EVIL INFLICTED ON THE COUNTRY BY THE OPERATION OF THE CORN LAWS.

SIR,

York, Feb. 10, 1834.

I think the enemies of our iniquitous Corn Laws overlook another impost of the aristocracy scarcely less onerous. They appear to have forgotten that we pay twice as much for beef, mutton, potatoes, &c., as such articles would cost importing from the continent.

I am, Sir, Your obedient humble Servant,

England being a great grazing country, Mr. Crawford's statement only shows about half the sum our aristocracy take out of our pockets.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We shall be happy to give insertion to all letters on topics of public interest, if they are properly authenticated, well written, short, and to the purpose, conditions that are reasonable as they are indispensable.

C. Whiting, Beaufort House, Strand.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1834.

STATE OF PARTIES IN THE PRESENT HOUSE OF  
COMMONS.

WE have long desired to make ourselves accurately acquainted with the state of parties in the present House of Commons, and to resolve the scattered and disjointed materials of which it is composed into something like a systematic division of sections or groups; but easy as the task might seem to those who have never attempted it, we have found it one of considerable difficulty; and after all our pains, we cannot assure ourselves of any thing beyond an approximation to something like tolerable accuracy.

The *first* great Section, immeasurably outweighing all the others, is that of the Whigs, or Ministerialists, or Moderate Reformers, for each of these names is assumed in turn by the members of the party in question. Their numbers exceed three hundred, and will include, at almost any time, three-fourths of the whole of any given assemblage of members, convened at any sitting, whether it be one hundred, or four hundred, or any intermediate number between these. The leader of this large party is Lord Althorp, and the Members of the Administration generally; and the chief bond of union between them appears to be:—first, a strong desire for public tranquillity, in the undisturbed and settled state of public affairs; secondly, great respect for their leader, and unbounded confidence in his good intentions and integrity; thirdly, a feeling of satisfaction at mingling and acting with the Aristocracy of the House, and upholding the authority of a Government likely to be very permanent, and to have therefore the dispensation of patronage for a long time to come. The tactics of this party are, to suggest to the Ministerial officers such measures as they may deem advisable, but to leave it entirely to the Government whether it be wise or prudent to act upon these suggestions or not—to rise in defence of the Ministerial policy whenever it is attacked—to cheer loudly the speeches of their leaders and of each other—to assist the Ministers in forming a House or not forming it, as the convenience of the moment may suggest—and to be ready, in whatever part of the building they may be during the debate, to come down at the ringing of the division bell, and add their forces to the majority. The strength of this party is at present quite overwhelming; not more, however, by

VOL. J.—SESSION OF 1834.



their numbers than by their union, their social intercourse with each other, and the submission of their private views, wills, and feelings, to the acknowledged authority of a head and leader; with all the advantages of a well organized discipline, strictly maintained by the younger holders of office and aspirants for public employment, who volunteer their services for its support.

The second Section in the House is that of the Tories, who number about one hundred and seventy, and who include almost as many Scotch and Irish Members as English. It is difficult to name any one person as the leader of this party. Sir Robert Peel is undoubtedly the most able and influential of their body; but he is not sufficiently a Tory for many of them, and the party do not therefore recognize him as their chief, though he is the most constant in his attendance, the most frequent in his speeches, and the most efficient member of their whole body by far. Mr. Alexander Baring, perhaps, comes the next after Sir Robert Peel in his punctuality of attendance, and frequency of speech; but then he is so unsettled in his views, and so uncertain in his votes, that little or no reliance is placed on him. Mr. Herries and Mr. Goulburn, both ex-officials, are among the most decided of the Tories; but their appearance in the House is indeed

“Like angel’s visits—few and far between;”

and therefore they produce no continuous effect. Although Sir Robert Inglis, the Member for the University of Oxford, and Mr. Frederick Shaw, the Member for the University of Dublin, are quite as high Tories as either of the persons named, and are among the most constant in their attendance, and most frequent in their speeches of almost any individuals in the House, they are no more recognized as leaders than the others. Sir Henry Hardinge is one of the most popular of their body with the House—Sir James Scarlett one of their most argumentative and skilful debaters; but though the party possesses many men besides those enumerated, of undoubted talents, unimpeachable integrity, and great individual influence, their force as a body is so small, that they can effect little or nothing in the way of opposition, except in cases where they are allied either to the Whigs or the Liberals, with both of whom they occasionally coalesce. Their tactics are very undisciplined compared with that of the Whigs, but their bond of union is much stronger; and there is consequently more fidelity, stronger adherence to each other, and more of true party-spirit among them than among any other section of the House. Their aristocratical connexions; their still lingering hope of returning to office; their meetings at the Conservative Club; their sympathy with the House of Lords; their abundant wealth, and free and frequent social intercourse; with their horror of all plebeian and democratic inroads on what they deem the just privileges of birth, rank, and opulence, knit them together so closely, that we think they may rely more firmly on each other in any case of emergency requiring cordial co-operation, than any other party in the state.

The third Section in the House is the Liberal, or Radical, or Democratical party, who go as much beyond the Whigs and Moderate Reformers, as these go beyond the Tories; and who, if not actual Republicans in principle, are yet desirous of strengthening, by every possible means, the power of the people, by extending the suffrage,

shortening the duration of Parliament, taking the burthens from the poor to place them upon the rich, and curtailing all the unjust privileges of the few to give the most extensive enjoyment of liberty to the many. The number of this party does not exceed one hundred and thirty; and if rigidly scrutinized, not more perhaps than one hundred; so that they are not much more than half as numerous as the Tories, especially if some of the old or high Whigs, as they are called, be added to the number of the latter, and not more than one-third the numerical force of the Whigs or Ministerialists. There is, however, another division of this party, into Irish and English. The Irish party of the Liberals, have a leader, and it cannot be denied, an earnest, an eloquent, and a powerful one, in the person of Mr. O'Connell, to whom a great number are so entirely devoted, from similarity of sentiment, we sincerely believe, that he may rely upon their presence, and cordial support, in almost any measure he may think fit to advocate or oppose. These are the Members chiefly advocating the Repeal of the Legislative Union. The English party of the Liberals, though quite as devotedly attached to the principles they advocate, and though powerful enough, if united, to make even Whigs and Tories respect their strength, are yet, for want of this necessary bond, altogether powerless. They have no leader whatever, nor does there seem any very great probability of there soon possessing one: for even the attempts that have been made by ourselves and others, to organize some plan of operations, by the formation of a Liberal Club, and by fixed periodical meetings, for the purpose of concerting measures, and acting in concord, to effect some common end, have been treated with utter neglect and indifference.

Of the experience, knowledge, talent, and capacity for business, possessed by the Liberal party, in the aggregate, there can be no doubt. There are no men in the House who have more *experience* in Parliamentary affairs than Mr. Hume, or Mr. Warburton;—none who have more *knowledge* of the true principles of political science than Mr. Grote and Colonel Torrens;—none who have more *talent* for stating their views clearly and eloquently than Mr. Harvey, or Mr. Wilks; either of which six would form a good leader; and with such men as Mr. Bulwer, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Aglionby, Mr. Ewart, Mr. Puller, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Jervis, Mr. Romilly, and a number of similarly young, active, and clever adherents, they might form the nucleus of a party which would soon absorb a large portion of the floating waverers who still hang upon the skirts of ministerial favour; but who would soon rally round a Liberal standard, if one were erected under the auspices of a powerful and influential leader. The objections urged against the Members we have named, as competent to take this lead are these:

Mr. Hume, it is alleged, though thoroughly conversant with all the business of Parliament, and well acquainted with financial details, is not sufficiently well grounded in the *science* of Politics, to be able to maintain general principles with the force and effect necessary in a leader of a party. He is also deemed deficient in the art of clear and lucid arrangement of his thoughts, as well as in the power of giving utterance to them in a persuasive and impressive manner. And lastly, it is considered that he wants that warmth of temperament, that cor-

duality of disposition, that love of social intercourse, and that charm of personal courtesy and kindness, which should win men first by the gentle blandishment of manners, and retain them afterwards by the joint influence of public principle and personal affection.

To Mr. Warburton many of the same objections are thought to apply. As a man of science and general information, few persons doubt his complete fitness; and though not an eloquent man, he has the faculty of stating his views with great clearness and precision. But in the personal qualifications necessary for a leader, he is considered even more deficient than Mr. Hume, being more austere and cold in his manners, more difficult to be moved from any position he may assume, and altogether destitute of that attractive charm of winning adherents by a cordial outpouring of the heart in first approaches, and retaining them afterwards by unabated warmth of social intercourse.

Mr. Grote is considered to embrace the greatest number of requisites for a leader of the Liberal party: but even in him some deficiencies are perceived. As a man of profound knowledge in political science, a follower of Bentham and Ricardo, an opulent banker, and a member for the first commercial city in the kingdom; as a speaker, who exceeds all others in the House perhaps, in the clearness, brevity, and force with which his statements are made: and as a gentleman of simple and unostentatious habits, great kindness of disposition, and easy and affable manners, he has a combination of qualities, which are hardly to be found united in the same degree perhaps in any other individual. But the drawbacks are—First, that his speeches, though perfect in their composition, and such as if taken down verbatim could hardly be improved in diction by any subsequent retouching, are delivered with a coldness of manner, a fixedness of attitude, and an abstractedness from personal feeling, zeal or energy, which makes it an effort of labour to keep up the strained attention of the hearer, which stirs up no one emotion of the heart, which kindles no fire in the bosom, but which engages the reason only in the investigation, and leaves the feelings and the passions entirely untouched: speeches admirably adapted for a select assembly of sages and philosophers like himself, but far beyond the average capacity of the mixed multitude to whom they are addressed. Secondly, that Mr. Grote is a new member, not yet sufficiently versed in the forms and tactics of the House, nor sufficiently ready, if he were, to rise, at any given moment, and turn an incident or an expression to his purpose, and carry the enemies' lines by a skilful manœuvre, or a well-turned attack—an art in which Mr. Stanley especially excels, and by which he often effects more for his party than even by the splendid talents which all must admit him to possess.

Colonel Torrens is to the full as scientific and as well informed as Mr. Grote, and on subjects of political economy more especially, is beyond all comparison the most experienced man in the House. His speeches, however, like Mr. Grote's, though incapable of subsequent improvement, and generally perfect at the time of their delivery—are too finished Essays for the understandings of those to whom they are addressed—and require such an effort of thought to follow out in the hearing, that they often have the effect of causing persons to leave the House, as though they deemed it a loss of time to listen to that

which as far as their understandings could receive it, might just as well be uttered in an unknown tongue. In manners, the Colonel is more accessible and warmer than Mr. Grote, and would more easily attach followers to his standard by personal cordiality. But he has neither the opulence, nor the mercantile connexions, nor the station of importance from the place represented, possessed by Mr. Grote; and this more than counterbalances his greater experience and standing as a member.

Mr. Harvey is, we think—take him for all in all—the man of all others best calculated for a leader of the Liberal party in the present House of Commons. His parliamentary experience is quite as great as that of Mr. Hume or Mr. Warburton. As a man of scientific knowledge, he is inferior, no doubt, to Mr. Grote or Colonel Torrens:—but as a clear, lucid, powerful, and even eloquent speaker, there is no man of the English Liberal party that comes near to him. As a skilful debater, as one quick to conceive, and ready to reply—as a tactician prepared on all occasions to take advantage of every turn in favour of his argument or case, Mr. Harvey yields to no man on either side of the House: and for the adaptation of his speeches to the character of those whom he addresses—for the happy mixture of fact and opinion—argument and invective—reason and ridicule—with which his discourses are coloured—he is superior to them all. His manners, too, are eminently suited to the position of a leader—easy of approach, warm, cordial, affable, no assumption of superiority, cheerful concession of slight differences, active habits of business, close attendance in his place, power of commanding attention at all times, and great cheerfulness and good humour under any amount of opposition: all these mark him out, it is thought, as peculiarly fit to take the lead of the Liberal party in the House. The only drawbacks that we have ever heard are:—First, that he is not a man of sufficient weight or stake in the country, by his opulence or high connexions. Secondly, that the Benchers of Lincoln's Inn still persist in refusing to admit him to the bar; the first of which is an objection that would apply with equal force to any other of the leaders we have named; and the second of which is an act of the most flagrant injustice, which in the minds of all those who have taken the pains to read the evidence on the subject, and we confess ourselves among the number, reflects the greatest disgrace on the Benchers of Lincoln's Inn, and does not leave on the character of Mr. Harvey a single spot or blemish that he has not most effectually wiped away.

Mr. Wilks resembles Mr. Harvey in so many particulars, that it would be difficult not to speak of them together. As a man of very extensive information, political and literary, there are few men in the House superior to Mr. Wilks. As a consistent and long-tried friend of civil and religious liberty, and the advocate of the broadest principles of Reform, Mr. Wilks is well known to the world. In eloquence of the highest and most impassioned kind, he excels even any of those we have named, and sometimes pours forth a torrent of words and thoughts of the most glowing and ennobling character. He is also a man of opulence, retired from business, and wholly disengaged from all but his parliamentary duties. His political independence and integrity have stood the test of trial, and been found pure and unim-

## MOTION FOR INQUIRY INTO THE CONDUCT OF AN IRISH JUDGE.

THE motion made by Mr. O'Connell on Thursday the 13th instant, for an inquiry into the conduct of Sir William Smith, one of the judges of Ireland, gave rise to an animated debate, and led to so great a division of parties, that at its close, Sir James Graham and Mr. Spring Rice were found voting against their colleagues in the Ministry; Mr. Stanley and Mr. Littleton supporting Mr. O'Connell; and several of the habitual supporters of the Administration, such as Sir Matthew White Ridley, Mr. Hardy, and others, voting against them.

The question was one of great difficulty, we confess; and we think that a doubt may be reasonably entertained whether the decision on it was such as will be as much approved of a year hence as it is now. Baron Smith, the judge complained of, is accused of two very different ~~class~~ of offences: the one, irregularity of attendance, and sittings at late hours in his court; the other, availing himself of his position as a judge, to intersperse through his addresses to the Grand Jury, at the opening of an Assize, those political views and opinions which he is believed really to entertain. Let us look at these two offences separated from each other.

The first, that is, great irregularity of attendance, and sitting at very late hours in court, would be a fit subject of complaint from the barristers, solicitors, and suitors, whose interests might have been affected by such irregularities; and if a strong memorial had been presented to the Ministers from such parties against such irregularities, it would have been a good ground for their ordering an inquiry into the facts, and when proved, moving for an address to the Crown, if thought necessary, for the judge's suspension. But for a political opponent to take up the case without such a memorial, and involve the House of Commons in an inquiry as to certain alleged irregularities in the mode of transacting the judicial business of any particular court does appear to us a departure from a right course, which would lead, if followed up, to most oppressive and inquisitorial measures, affecting the respectability if not even the independence of the judicial character in general.

The second offence with which Baron Smith is charged, is that of having availed himself of the occasion of his addressing the Grand Juries at the opening of his Court, to give his views on politics and public affairs, which it is said is unbecoming in a judge, who should be perfectly neutral in politics, or at all events never let his political opinions escape from him when acting in his judicial capacity. Now the question that will present itself to most men's minds will be this: Supposing the political addresses of Baron Smith to have been in favour of the repeal of the Union instead of against it; supposing the learned judge to have condemned the Orange faction, and to have lauded the Catholics for their endeavours to obtain their constitutional rights by all constitutional means; supposing him to have said that, as all great reforms had been hitherto obtained only by agitation, so there was little or no hope of carrying any further improvement but by a similar demonstration of

public opinion; would Mr. O'Connell have deemed it derogatory to the judicial character, and moved for the learned Baron's removal from the bench on that ground? We think not; and we are of opinion that in the minds of the Ministers, as well as of Mr. O'Connell, it is not that the judge has political opinions, and that he openly proclaims them, which is the *real* offence; but that it is the kind, and quality, and description of politics which they dislike, and which they think proper to punish by their displeasure. As an advocate for fair play on all sides, we disapprove of this. We do not see why judges should not have political opinions as well as other men, nor can we assent to the propriety of the rule that they should never give utterance to them from the bench. Cases may continually arise, in which it may be of the utmost importance to the general tranquillity, that dangerous doctrines should be exposed, and sound opinions propagated; and the high station, learning, temper, gravity, and respect, associated with the office of a judge, would make such expositions of sound doctrines most influential and most valuable. We do not therefore see the harm in the practice that others appear to perceive; and we should certainly not condemn a judge for promulgating sound and useful political truths, but rather commend him for his so doing. It would then be wholly matter of opinion whether the doctrines maintained were sound or otherwise, and if we would allow the one we could not consistently condemn the other. The conclusion to which we come, therefore, is this; either that every allusion to politics and political opinions ought to be interdicted by some general act or law, to all men seated on the bench; or that if some were allowed to avail themselves of Grand Jury addresses to promulgate their particular views, all others in the same situation ought to be equally free to do the same.

Now, from the speeches delivered during this debate, it is clear that such practices have prevailed, and been not only permitted, but praised in times past; and we cannot see with what consistency those who lauded this practice then, can condemn it now. It is not often that we agree with Sir Robert Peel, and still more rarely that we accord with Sir James Scarlett; but in the present instance we must say they both showed good grounds against the motion; and to let our readers judge for themselves, we give a portion only of each of their speeches:

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, In addition to this, another charge was made against Mr. Baron Smith—namely, that he had introduced political matters into one of his charges. The right hon. gentleman opposite had admitted, that under certain circumstances a judge might be justified in doing that which was imputed as an offence to Mr. Baron Smith. If a political offence were to be tried in any county in his circuit, he then might, in that particular county, venture to give a warning to “the deluded instruments of agitation.” Good God! was it meant that that house should prescribe the precise terms in which a judge's charge must be couched? (Hear, hear.) Was it expected that that house should declare that it might be right in the judges to warn “the deluded instruments of agitation,” but they must take care not to extend their views beyond the horizon of the particular county in which they might happen to be? (Hear, hear.) Let the house recollect at what period it was Baron Smith felt it to be his duty to warn “the deluded instruments of agitation.” That learned judge was speaking at a time when the House of Commons had passed a bill which suspended and paralyzed all law, and placed the liberties, if not the lives, of the people of Ireland, at the discretion of courts-martial. (Hear, hear.) He (Sir R. Peel) approved of, and voted for, that bill, under a conviction that a stern necessity left him no choice;

but in judging of the supposed delinquency of Baron Smith, ought he to forget the circumstances under which that learned individual had delivered the charge which had been brought under the notice of the house? His right hon. friend opposite, if he might so call him (Mr. Littleton), had read a part of the charge, and had founded his acquiescence in the motion before the house on the single passage which he had quoted. Now, he (Sir R. Peel) would venture to say that his right hon. friend had put a wrong construction on that passage. His right hon. friend had represented Mr. Baron Smith as speaking of the whole Roman Catholic body as embracing neither property, rank, nor intelligence, but possessing merely physical force, and comprising only the vulgar numbers of the country. This, however, appeared to him (Sir R. Peel) to be a misinterpretation of Mr. Baron Smith's meaning. That learned judge was referring to the allegation, "that the universal people of Ireland" were in a conspiracy against the existing institutions of the country, and contended that neither the "universal people of Ireland" nor the Roman Catholic Body as a whole, were misled by inflammatory appeals. The learned judge then asked whether the body to which those appeals were addressed "embraced the property, rank, education, intelligence, or merely the physical force and vulgar numbers of the country?" (Hear, hear.) Was it probable that Mr. Baron Smith, one of the earliest and most consistent advocates of the Roman Catholic claims, and descended, as he (Sir R. Peel) believed, from one Roman Catholic parent, would speak of the Roman Catholics as a body in terms so insulting as those which his right hon. friend supposed the learned judge applied to them? (Hear, hear.) Let it be remembered, too, that Mr. Baron Smith was speaking at a time when all law was suspended, and when the constitution had been abrogated by the act of the Legislature. In this state of things, how was it possible for Mr. Baron Smith to warn "the deluded instruments of agitation," unless he were permitted to refer to the great passing topics of the day connected with agitation? (Hear, hear.)

The learned judge in his charge, said—"Tithes, rates, rents, salaries, privileges, old institutions, establishments, public taxes—I stop here; but will those, to whose aims I am adverting do the same? Not of themselves I am afraid; but the wisdom of our Government and the vigour of our laws, may discountenance their temerity, and with a firm hand arrest their progress. So far as is connected with the due control and influence (there was a time when I should have said majesty) of that with which I have most concern—the law—I conceive the epidemic of our day to be a turbulent abuse of the valuable right of petition, making it a channel for the conveyance not of submissive prayer, but of refractory invective and insolent dictation—an abuse which seeks indeed to turn what it so distorts (as was done about two centuries ago) into the means of demolition, and what Shakspeare, I think, has called, "hurly-burly innovation," an appetite for which latter seems the main spring of insurrectionary movement at the present time, while those who instigate it may be turning the restless impulse to purposes more regular and systematic, and more their own. But they cannot ride the whirlwind if the wisdom of our rulers will not suffer it to rise: nor can they direct and point a storm which that wisdom will have allayed. Have I exaggerated the distinctions of the right of petition at the present day? Have I overstated those perversions which render its nature something contrastedly different from its name? Hear, as reported in the public prints, the description given of this right as exercised at the present moment by its friend and partisans. A Cabinet Minister speaks, and this without any censure, of "petition converted into almost peremptory demand." A political character of great notoriety signs his name to a requisition to the people, "to be up and stirring—to confide in themselves—to begin the war of tithe petitions—to prepare for the war of repeal petitions." He (Sir R. Peel) was aware that it might be said that these topics did not immediately come under the notice of Mr. Baron Smith; but was that learned gentleman to be blamed if he adverted to them, knowing, as he did, that the Legislature had been under the necessity of planning the liberties of Ireland under the control of courts-martial; that the consequence of tithe petitions was the total suspension of the payment of tithes; and fearing, as he probably did, that the getting up of repeal petitions might have an equally pernicious if not more baneful effect? (Hear, hear.)

If he found the Minister of the day declaring that he would resist to the death the war against tithes, was he acting inconsistently with his duty if he warned the peasantry against listening to the appeals of agitators? (Hear, hear.) He (Sir R. Peel) thought, that whatever might be the learned judge's duty in ordinary times, it should not be forgotten that he was speaking on the occasion alluded to at a time when the lives and property of the people of Ireland were threatened by insurrectionary violence, and when the King thought it incumbent not to confine his displeasure to those who had actually violated the law, but to express his just indignation against those who, observing the form and letter of the law, disturbed and inflamed the country by resorting to the artifices of agitation. (Cheers.) The House of Commons had echoed that sentiment in the address to His Majesty. They assured His Majesty that "they participated in his feeling of just indignation at the attempts made to excite the people to demand a repeal of the legislative union, and that they were convinced that to none more than to the deluded instruments of the agitation thus perniciously excited was the continuance of such a spirit productive of the most ruinous consequences; and that His Majesty might rely upon their united and vigorous exertions, in conjunction with all the loyal and well-affected, in aid of the Government to put an end to a system of excitement and violence, which, while it continues, was destructive of the peace of society, and, if successful, must inevitably prove fatal to the power and safety of the United Kingdom." Such were the terms in which they had addressed His Majesty. They had called upon all loyal subjects to unite in putting an end to a dangerous excitement, and the first practical proof they gave of their desire to see the system of agitation cease was to punish Mr. Baron Smith for pointing out the dangers and evils which must be felt from its continuance. If the House of Commons agreed to follow the course recommended by the hon. and learned member for Dublin, the inference drawn by the people would be that the cause of repeal would be triumphant. (Hear, hear.) They could come to no other conclusion when they saw that a learned judge was put upon his trial because he discountenanced the attempts made to delude those unfortunate instruments of agitation who formed the first objects of His Majesty's compassionate regard. (Hear, hear)

SIR JAMES SCARLETT said, As to the charge of political partizanship,—no man, he thought, ought to be made a judge from politics. (Hear, hear.) If he had any it was his duty to lay them aside when he went to the Bench. (Hear, hear.) Nothing was more detestable than a political judge. (Hear, hear.) But on account of the judicial establishment in general, unless found combined with some perversion of justice, some complaint which that house was bound to notice, the circumstance was not in itself a valid ground to appoint a select committee for inquiry. (Cheers.) He now came to another part of the case. Allusion had been made to the King's Speech. Might they not indulge in the same topics with His Majesty when he spoke to all parties? (Cries of "No, no," and "Hear, hear.") When His Majesty had declared his determination to support by all the means in his power the legislative union between this country and Ireland, and to resist all attempts at its agitation, was it a great sin, was it very iniquitous for a judge, considering the state of feeling which the Government and the King professed, to declare it publicly from the bench, and warn the people against being deluded into the commission of crime by the influence of agitation? (Hear, hear.) But the hon. and learned gentleman, (the Solicitor-General) had said that the judge was insulting the grand jury. That was a very serious charge. But had the right hon. Secretary for Ireland received intimation from any of the grand jury of the fact? Had any of the grand jury so represented? (Hear, hear.) He (Sir J. Scarlett) would take the liberty of stating what he had heard, and seconded in print, that the learned judge had received a deputation from the grand jury, who expressed their unanimous approbation of his charge. (Cheers.) A Roman Catholic, too, was one of the number (renewed cheers); and yet his hon. and learned friend had, in a spirit of the most perfect impartiality—*ex uno disce omnia*—stated, that Baron Smith had insulted the Roman Catholics by the speech he had pronounced. (Cheers.) No such interpretation could be put upon the passage in question. He had been addressing both Protestants and Catholics; he reminded them that in union lay their safety, and that those who



agitated did not consist of persons of rank, wealth, education, and influence in the country, but of the vulgar numbers of the people. He must confess he did not see such impropriety in this, being only a re-echo of His Majesty's speech, as to visit it with the indignation of that house. (Hear.) It was also alleged that an offence had been committed by the learned judge in promulgating politics and political economy from the bench. Now he (Sir J. Scarlett) was old enough to recollect that the judges in England, at the commencement of the last war, in their charges to grand juries were accustomed to warn the people generally against the introduction of French principles. He had heard a charge of that description delivered by Mr. Justice Buller, which had merited and obtained general approbation. Nay, he happened to know that instructions to that effect had been given to the different judges by the Lord Chancellor of that day. At the time to which he had just alluded, a proclamation was issued by the Crown, calling upon all judges' and magistrates, in their several capacities, to aid and assist the government in putting down the attempts made to create sedition and encourage disaffection in various parts of the country. The judges upon that occasion did, as might be expected, their duty. Mr. Justice Buller, as he had already mentioned, delivered a charge, which did him the highest honour. In that charge he contrasted the constitution of this country with the anarchy of France, and showed from the contrast the superior advantages which the people of England enjoyed. The learned judge was not deemed guilty of impropriety in making allusion to the anarchy which then prevailed in France. Though there was no crime in the calendar which warranted the remarks he had introduced into his charge, it was not imputed to him as an offence that he had used the influence of his station to repress the disaffection which at that time existed. (Hear, hear.) He asked his hon. and learned friend opposite to consider the consequences which were likely to result from acceding to the present motion. A select committee was moved for to inquire into the conduct of a learned judge with a view to remove him from the bench. His hon. and learned friend had admitted that if the charges now made against the learned judge were substantiated, he must as a matter of course be removed. By anticipation, therefore, his hon. and learned friend admitted that the charges were true (loud cries of "Hear"); for no government he thought could be so weak as to put a judge upon trial unless it believed the charges against him to be true. The speech of his hon. and learned friend, when stripped of all periphrasis, amounted to this—"We think the charges against the learned baron true—if true, they ought to be inquired into—and if proved to be so, he must be removed." (Cheers.) Now if His Majesty's Government had placed the charges, of which they thus admitted the truth, upon the table, and had declared their intention of moving an address for the removal of the learned baron, all that would have been in order; but this was not the course which they had deemed it expedient to pursue. (On a suggestion made by the hon. and learned member for Dublin, that the learned judge had sat on two nights later than suited the public convenience, without any imputation that he had by such late sittings done injury or injustice to any person (hear, hear),—and on another suggestion that the learned judge had made an address to a grand jury, in which he had adopted the language of the King's Speech, and advised them not to follow the path of agitation, but to repress it (loud cries of "Hear"); on these two suggestions the house was to dismiss the learned judge from the bench, or rather was to appoint a committee to do it. (Reiterated cries of "Hear.") Now if such a course were adopted by the house, every judge in Ireland, who valued his independence, ought to resign immediately his seat upon the bench. (Hear, hear.) He deprecated this motion as pregnant with alarm and danger, and he could not sit down without expressing his astonishment that it should have received the sanction of His Majesty's Government. (Hear, hear.)

We repeat our conviction that a year hence, when personal and political feeling shall have calmed on this subject, and when reason and reflection shall alone be the instruments of judgment exercised on the question, there will be many who would rather see their names in the minority than in the majority of the division.

## SKETCH OF THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULEY, ESQ., LATE MEMBER FOR LEEDS.

[Concluded from the Preceding Number.]

THE first partial success of Mr. Macauley in the House of Commons, did not induce him to renounce the profession of the law. He had been some time called to the bar, and had been appointed by his Whig patrons a Commissioner of Bankrupts. It is needless to say that these situations were generally rather the reward of interest than of merit, and that the public too often suffered from the glaring incompetency of the individuals appointed. They were for the most part scions of nobility, or men of political connexions, who were thus provided for at the expense of the country. Allowing to the fullest extent the ability, and eloquence, and general learning of Mr. Macauley, we must at the same time avow that he was not fitted for this situation. Of the theory of law he knew not a very great deal; and of the practice of law he knew nothing at all. No man can read the Reports of Mr. Montague and Mr. Bligh without being aware that in the Bankruptcy Jurisdiction, cases sometimes arise of very great nicety, involving some of the knottiest and most intricate questions. In dealing with these topics, uninviting to the general scholar, Mr. Macauley exhibited neither readiness nor aptitude. Indeed it was evident enough that he was entirely innocent of the subject, and though possessed of a philosophical and capacious mind, his warmest admirers could not say that he had a legal one. This observation is not meant as a reproach. A legal mind may be the gift of a far inferior intellect. No man will deny the general powers of a Mackintosh or a Brougham, yet both these eminent men were, in this requisite for the bar, inferior to the Sugdens, and Scarletts, and Campbells. A quick and vigorous understanding, a sharp and discriminating judgment, a strong and retentive memory, are main qualifications for practice; but the higher order of eloquence and intellect—philosophic generalization—conceived in the spirit of a Montesquieu, a Beccaria, and the great authorities of the old civil law, and the publicists of Holland, Germany, and Italy, would, in a modern English court of justice, be entirely misplaced and thrown away. A yard and a half of cases, and no mention of principle, are here in most request. The business of a judge and counsel in our day is *jus dicere*, not *jus dare*, and though Mr. Macauley is as fitted as any man to say what laws ought to be, the want of practice and of a passion for his former profession would disqualify him from being an expounder of what laws are.

The subject of our sketch continued to go the Northern Circuit till he was appointed to Office by the Government of Lord Grey; but he exhibited no enthusiastic predilection for his profession, and was, we have heard, more frequently found with a volume of Lord Bacon or Burke in his hand, than with Barnwall and Alderson, or Harrison or Jeremy's Digested Index. These latter compilations, to use a Germanism, must be the "hand-books" of the practical lawyer. We there-

fore doubt that Mr. Macauley (unless he changed altogether the course of his studies and the bent of his mind) could ever have risen to eminence in his adopted profession. Fortunately it is for himself—we hope it may be fortunate too for the public—that he has abandoned the bar for far higher and nobler duties. It will be a distinction honourable to the age, and glorious to the man, to rescue millions of human beings from the miseries of a traditionary and unwritten Code—which, however equitably or mildly administered, has yet the disadvantage of being undefined. “They may talk as they will,” says Lord Camden, “of equity—they may vaunt its justice to the skies—but the very moment it becomes vague and indefinite it is just the length of my Lord Chancellor’s foot,—short or long, narrow or broad, as the case may be.” So we say of the Zillah and Sudder Dewannee courts. The men who sit therein are excellent good men, humane, intelligent, enlightened; but the Code they administer is *jus vagum et indefinitum*—it is not written in the permanency of print, but it too often abides in the breast of the magistrate; and as the magistrate, however perfect, is yet a man, and actuated and governed by human feelings, it is well to define his duties by strict limits; for prejudice and passion, and the waywardness even of a benevolent spirit, will sometimes lead the best men astray, from the best motives, and often guide and govern the bold and bad man to the commission of injustice, to the screening of the guilty, and the oppression of the innocent.

Happy then is it for the natives of India that the task of giving law to millions has fallen to the lot of one who has the enlargement to comprehend, the courage to undertake, and the eloquence to support and sustain such great reforms. For this he puts to hazard his life, and leaves in the spring of a distinguished existence his native country to benefit a people he has never seen. The thought of his high vocation, the magnitude of the great trust reposed in him, should support him in all cases of difficulty and obstruction, and that he will meet abundant difficulties and obstructions no man can doubt. But let him reflect that it rarely falls to the lot of any man to have the power (alas! must we also say still seldomer to have the will) to do so much good as he may do. Let him then proceed boldly, for the eyes of Europe and Asia will be steadily fixed on his proceedings. Let him act with the dignity which belongs to wisdom—steadily, severely, courageously; and let him remember, that as we lost one hemisphere by blind obstinacy, and foolish pride, and misplaced coercion, be his the task to preserve the other by the sway of a rule which dispenses protection and justice, and causes the obligations of India to England to be written in the heart of every native, from one end of Hindostan to the other.

The last task that remains to us is to touch on the subsequent Parliamentary efforts of Mr. Macauley, and to make some few observations on the character of his mind, and the peculiarities of his style and appearance.

Mr. Macauley has not been a frequent speaker in Parliament. But his displays have one great recommendation always wanting to the efforts of Lord Brougham. He is never tediously long, as the Chancellor almost invariably was; and when he does use a redundancy of words, his hearers are fully compensated by fertility of imagination, or some rare

felicity of thought. During the year 1831 he did not speak above half a dozen times (we speak from memory, and without having referred to any authentic record of Parliamentary proceedings), and on four of these occasions the Reform Bill was his theme. These discourses were distinguished by a flow of masterly language, pure diction, and vigorous powers of reasoning and fancy. They not only excited the admiration of friends, but they extorted the approbation—the willing approbation we allow—of political opponents. That Warmhearted, wrong-headed, and really learned Tory, Sir Charles Wetherell, paid the highest compliments to Mr. Macauley; and Mr. Croker (decidedly the most competent judge of a public speaker now living, and who rose to answer the Member for Calne,) said that “his talents cast a shade on the servants of the Crown.” Though the speeches of the rising Orator were on these occasions distinguished by a generous and elevated feeling, and powers of diction equalled by no man in our day, and surpassed only by Bacon, Bolingbroke, and Burke,\* yet some of his admissions were so general and unguarded—some of his principles so questionable—and the general want of tact so apparent, that Mr. Croker, who rose after Mr. Macauley—with certainly a worse cause—had a complete and signal victory. Mr. Croker, however, has had the advantage of twenty-eight years’ experience; he is naturally amongst the astutest and most critical of men, and there is no one more prompt to perceive, or more ready to turn to his own advantage, the weak points of his opponent. Of a playful fancy, and caustic wit—a wit almost amounting to malignity—with a keen perception of the ridiculous, profound and correct information, great readiness, and a coolness and self-possession bordering almost on what his detractors call impudence—but which is, perhaps, after all, but a strong confidence in his own superior powers—it is not wonderful that he should raise the laugh against an inexperienced man, dealing in eloquent generalities, and enunciating noble and generous sentiments with the zeal of a new convert, and the sincerity of a generous and manly nature.

Nevertheless, and although unable on this occasion to cope with Mr. Croker, the Ministry had “marked” Mr. Macauley “for their own.” Shortly after he was appointed to office; and in October, 1831, exhibited his gratitude to his new patrons by another speech on the Reform Bill, at a period of great and general excitement. It was on this occasion he exclaimed—“What, after all, is an Act of Parliament? It is a piece of parchment, or a piece of paper, with the King’s Arms at the top, and the King’s Printer’s name placed at the bottom; but as an Act of Parliament it has no force—the law has no eyes, or hands, or vitality, until public will has breathed into it the breath of life, and stamped it with the impress of public opinion.” These and other general statements were caught at by Mr. Croker, and turned to admirable party purposes by that dexterous debater and sharp-sighted critic. As a man of wit and point—as a speaker *fin et rusé*—as an adroit tactician, and an accomplished *tirailleur*, Mr. Croker had a great superiority over his opponent. But he wanted the rich and

---

\* \* We should also add Jeremy Taylor, from whom Burke has largely borrowed. Every man who aspires to be an orator should make Taylor his constant study.

flowing diction—the *verba ardentia*—the rapid and brilliant eloquence—the tone of contemplative and philosophic thought, which conspicuously marked the speech of Mr. Macauley. The effort of the one was characterized by what Talleyrand calls *les résistances de l'habitude*; that of the other by what he equally happily designates *les entreprises de l'imagination*.

When the Reform Bill had passed, Mr. Macauley presented himself to the electors of Leeds, where he was received with demonstrations of enthusiasm. During the Session of 1833, he addressed the House about half a dozen times. His first effort was in favour of the Irish Coercion Bill; but instead of applying himself to the merits of the measure then before the House, he pronounced a discourse—characterised it must be admitted, by great historical research and closeness of reasoning—on the Repeal of the Legislative Union. This discourse placed the difficulties of a separate Legislature under a united Executive in a strong light; but this was not the question before the House. Mr. Macauley had evidently prepared himself with the arguments he urged in reference to Repeal, in the anticipation that Mr. O'Connell would dilate on this part of the subject; but the Irish agitator was silent on his favourite topic, on the other side of the channel, and Mr. Macauley, who had all his *impromptus à loisir* ready cut and dry, was unwilling to lose the opportunity of firing them off. This circumstance sufficiently disclosed the labour and preparation which he bestowed on his speeches. The ignorant and short-sighted hereupon commenced to run down the member for Leeds, as though it were a crime for a speaker to digest and arrange his matter and arguments before hand; but Mr. Macauley, and every other public man, may well despise such critics as these. No one ever became a great writer or a great speaker off hand. Boileau, one of the most correct and critical of poets, conjured all followers of the muses to *pollisez et repollisez*, and almost all distinguished speakers and writers have adopted his advice. Rousseau paused on every word, and balanced each sentence. And Moore, all careless though he appears, is remarkable for laborious study. Canning has been known to write passages of his speeches five or six times over before delivery; and Mr. Therry, in his edition of the speeches of that eloquent statesman, gives a *fac simile* of the repeated minute corrections and transpositions which he made in preparing these proofs for the press after delivery. Lord Brougham and Sir Robert Peel have on all set occasions prepared their speeches. It is said that the peroration of the former to his speech on the Reform of the Law cost him days and nights of labour and revision. Its truth, reflexion, and weighing of the subject in all its parts, arrangement of the details, illustration and pointing of the diction are but a portion of the business of an Orator. The effect which may be produced by a by-tone, by a look, by a sneer, nay, by a very whisper, is sufficiently attested by the example of Lord Chatham, Mr. Canning, and Mr. Stanley. How artfully, with a view to effect, did Sir Robert Peel marshal the murders of a whole Irish family in the last session? This passage, in the mouth of an unprepared speaker, would be a mere vulgar horror; but what a harrowing, and soul subduing interest did it receive from the practised and prepared phrase of the Ex-Secretary for the Home Department? It is, therefore, no reproach to Mr. Macauley to compose his speeches before-

hand. The men who adopt a contrary course though "they may write like angels," will assuredly, to use Garrick's quotation, in reference to Goldsmith "talk like poor Poll."

Mr. Macauley spoke a second time in support of the Coercive Bill, on the 28th of February last. This speech was a decided failure. Every sentence told for the opponents of the measure, and the orator was cheered to the echo by the opposition Members. Mr. Stanley sat still, transfixed as it were to his seat. "Was it for this, says Mr. Macauley, that they had the Reformed Parliament? (Cheers from the Opposition.) Have we slain the lion to be devoured by the wolf? (Loud cheering from the Opposition side.) Have we fought the battle against the proudest Aristocracy in the world in order that an Oligarchy, which has since sprung up, should rule in its stead? (Continued cheers from the Opposition.) An Oligarchy which had no title to power but the lenity of the Government and its own audacity? (Continued cheers from the same side.)" Fortunately for the speaker, Mr. Croker was not a member of the Reformed Parliament, or he would have exclaimed, "What are the Tories slain, that the people may be coerced by the Whigs?" Had Mr. Macauley ever practised at his profession, or had he controlled his strong and eloquent impulses, he must have seen the impolicy of this line of argument. He was but forging the weapon for his opponents.

His speech in favour of the Jews pronounced in the debate on Mr. Robert Grant's motion in the ensuing April, was of a much higher kind of eloquence, and infinitely more successful. The only other discourse of Mr. Macauley's, that we remember, was that on West India Slavery. For a while he was undetermined what course to take on this question; whether to support or oppose the Government resolutions. This uncertainty gave the Ministry great uneasiness; and it is said, we know not how truly, that they found that even the eloquence and fulness ("out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh") of their *protégé* encumbered them as much as his present indecision gave them embarrassment. It is thought that the proposition to go out to India was made at this juncture to Mr. Macauley. And the speech made by him in the discussion on the New India Bill, which endeavoured to cover the India Company and its servants with eulogies, as having been the benefactors and saviours of that devoted land, was more like the prophetic vision of one who looked to India, as his future home, and who painted it in those brilliant colours in which his fervid imagination sought to clothe it for his own reception, rather than a sober judgment founded on the evidence of those facts which its past history so abundantly furnishes. The whole speech was beautiful: but it was like a fairy tale, or a vision of enchantment, which left the more painful impression after its delivery, by the melancholy feeling that it wanted the chief ingredient of enduring oratory—fidelity and truth.

There are not wanting those who state openly, that a noble and learned lord had become excessively jealous of the literary and oratorical fame of the Member for Leeds. Of his literary reputation, indeed, the highest man in the land might well be jealous; but seeing that his oratory, however eloquent, almost as often made out the case of his opponents, as his own supposed views, we cannot believe that these assertions of Lord Brougham's enemies are well-grounded. Be that

as it may, Mr. Macauley has made his election; and in so far as his pecuniary and worldly interests are concerned perhaps wisely made it. But it sometimes happens that in seeking after mammon too exclusively, men make a shipwreck of what is far better—reputation and fame. We pray fervently that all three may be assured to our eloquent countryman. May his brows be encompassed by fame and honour, by wealth and success!

It remains for us but to say a few words on the merits of Mr. Macauley as a writer and a speaker. In both capacities he excels in a luminous explanation and display of his subject; in both he brings all that is necessary to decorate, establish, and illustrate his subject; in both he possesses a high degree of creative power, and the faculty of combining images in a new and varied order; in both he draws unlimitedly on past history, out of whose dry and withered bones he extracts the marrow untouched by the “tooth of time;”—the “shells and husks” he leaves to the precedent-monger, and the pedantic lawyer, but the spirit he never allows to evaporate or escape his grasp. Nor is he a *Doctrinaire*, for with all his learning and eloquence he loves truth better than any child of the brain which he may dignify with the name of system. As a writer he is too sketchy and comprehensive to be always correct, but he never fails to be eloquent, and it is rarely he is not luminous and pointed.

As a speaker Mr. Macauley's chief defects arise from an ardent temperament, and a mind full even to overflowing. He wants the craft, and caution, and reserve of a practised Orator. His principles are too general to render him a safe auxiliary to a Minister. He does not “crib and cabin” himself in by restrictive clauses; and in the skirmish his lines are too exposed, and too extended, not to suffer severely in the encounter. His ardour often hurries him into a position from which he cannot retreat. It is besides, in many senses, a disadvantage to him that his mind is so imbued with literature. What he gains in scholarship over his opponent, he loses in knowledge of the world and of mankind. He is young enough to overcome all these blemishes—for they are not faults: they are the defects of a youthful recluse too strong in his reliance on past history and mere book learning. We have said that in powers of eloquent exposition Mr. Macauley is without a rival. In clearness, terseness, and knowledge of the art and bye-play of debate he is greatly inferior to Mr. Stanley. In smoothness, and caution, and dignity, and temper, he is greatly below Sir Robert Peel. In contemptuous sarcasm, and energetic power, he is not what Lord Brougham was when in the Commons. In critical acumen, in caustic wit, in keen irony, in general information, and feline wariness, he cannot be compared to Mr. Croker. But he has a “richer wardrobe of words”—a more gorgeous imagination—a more eloquent fancy, and a more comprehensive and philosophic mind than any or all of those; and if he be not so successful in the encounter of debate, he is heard with more pleasure by the philosopher and the philanthropist, for his sentiments are grateful and elevating to our common humanity, and honourable alike to our age and country. And should Mr. Macauley again appear in St. Stephen's, cooled by age, and matured by experience, his speeches may be perhaps read when the effusions of all the other eminent names we have mentioned are nearly forgotten. *Vive et vale!*

## FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE CHANCELLOR. PROPOSED REPEAL OF TAXES.

ONE of the most important evenings of the present Session was Friday, the 14th inst., when Lord Althorp gave his financial statement to the House. The attendance of Members was very numerous, as early as five o'clock, and great curiosity evidently existed to hear the Chancellor's statement. It occupied a long time in the delivery, but its substance may be told in a very few sentences.

It appeared that on the 5th of January last, the revenue exceeded the expenditure by a sum of 1,500,000*l.*, added to which, it was calculated that an extra sum from the duties on tea would be brought into the Exchequer by its decreased price and increased consumption, amounting to 600,000*l.*, and this, with a saving of 800,000*l.* in the Estimates of the present year, would leave the Chancellor in possession of a surplus of 2,600,000*l.* to dispose of. Of this, he would require 800,000*l.* per annum for the interest of the loan of 20,000,000*l.* to be raised for paying the grant to the West India planters; and 600,000*l.* he should think necessary to retain for contingencies, which would reduce the actual surplus to 1,200,000*l.*; and this being nearly the whole amount of the House Tax, he intended to remit that tax entirely; retaining, however, the tax on windows, that is supposing between this and the 5th of April, he should not be compelled to take off any other tax of equal amount by the House of Commons; in which case the House Tax must be retained, as he had but 1,200,000*l.* to remit; and if that were trenched in upon by any one tax being removed, the balance only would remain at his disposal to be remitted in any other.

This statement had the merit of great simplicity and explicitness. No one could mistake it. The difficulty of obtaining assent, however, to any proposition of finance, plainly arises, as we have often before observed, from the opposing interests into which the representative body are divided. Accordingly, while the Metropolitan members, on whose constituents this House Tax presses most heavily, were quite satisfied with the relief thus afforded to them as far as it went, lamenting, however, that it did not include the Window Tax too; the Agricultural and County members were all dissatisfied to find that though the distress of the proprietors and occupiers of land was so pointedly admitted in the King's Speech, no promise of relief had been held out to them; and the Mercantile and Shipping members were equally disappointed to find that no remissions of duties or taxes were proposed for them.

The debate which arose out of these conflicting views, furnished the strongest illustration of the absurdity as well as injustice of our present system of taxation, and greatly confirmed us in the conviction we have long entertained, that there will be no sensible or effectual relief from



the public burthens of the country, until the whole system is revised—until all taxes, duties, and imposts on commodities and things, are progressively removed, and the whole amount of our revenue drawn from a graduated Tax on Property and Income, making the very wealthy pay heavily in proportion to their opulence, the moderately wealthy pay moderately in proportion to their means, and the labouring poor relieved from every fiscal burthen whatever. Till that is done, it will be a constant fight of one interest against another, and they who are most numerous, most powerful, most united, and most persevering, will carry the day.

The questions of a Free Trade with France, and of the Corn Laws, were adverted to during the debate, but with no cheering omen of good on either of these topics. The Legislative Assemblies of France being composed, like our own, principally of very opulent men; who have large properties in iron-mines, and forests that furnish charcoal for its smelting, as well as in manufactories of various kinds, resist every advance towards a free trade with England, because it would affect their pecuniary interests, to which, of course, they make the interests of the rest of the community but a secondary consideration. The two Houses of Parliament in England being mainly composed of persons who have large estates in land, are equally averse to the admission of foreign corn, because they believe it will lower their rents, and before that consideration all others must of course give way; so that each nation, instead of benefiting the other by the free interchange of their surplus produce and manufactures, seem determined to destroy each other by this non-intercourse system, as effectually as by the most sanguinary war. We believe that the entire abolition of the Corn Laws would effect more for the relief of the British nation at large than the taking off all the taxes that it is in the power of the Ministers to remove; and we further believe, that unless this be done, and done speedily, relief from taxation will come too late, as our manufacturing superiority will have passed into foreign hands, and whenever that takes place we shall gradually sink in the scale of nations, lower and lower every year. Our advice therefore is, Let the whole nation rally round this one question, a Free Trade in Corn, and lay aside all minor matters till this is achieved.

#### INQUIRY OF PROLONGING MENTAL DARKNESS.

Referring to the barbarous anecdote of "Certain Scythian Slaves" who "had their eyes destroyed, that they might work the harder," Thomson remarks, that "to extinguish human understanding, and establish a kingdom of darkness, is just so far more barbarous than even that monstrous cruelty, as the mind excels the body; or as understanding and reason are superior to sense."

#### RESPONSIBILITY OF HIGH OFFICE.

How happy the station which every minute furnishes opportunities of doing good to thousands! how dangerous that which every moment exposes to the injury of millions.—*La Bruyère.*

## ACQUITTAL OF MR. SHEIL OF ALL THE CHARGES AGAINST HIM.

As we anticipated, Mr. Sheil's innocence of the treachery imputed to him is established in the clearest and most unequivocal manner. The result has been such as to make him stand far higher than ever; and painful as must have been the period of suspense to him between the hour of accusation and the hour of acquittal, he will have great reason to rejoice that the accusation was made and refuted so triumphantly as it has been.

The Committee assembled to commence their labours immediately after the day of their appointment; and to Mr. Hill was confided the entire management of the prosecution—as it would have been called if it were a legal case. The two witnesses called by him for examination were Mr. Macauley, the late Member for Leeds, then on the point of taking his departure for India, and Mr. John Wood, late Member for Preston, and present Recorder for York.

The former of these gentlemen said, that the only conversation he ever had with Mr. Sheil on the state of Ireland, was some time *before* the Coercion Bill was brought into the House at all, and therefore nothing could have transpired of the nature alleged: besides which, even had the conversation been subsequent to that period, and had it involved any thing at variance with Mr. Sheil's public acts, he respected the sacredness of private confidence too highly to violate it by stating what had passed, unless compelled so to do against his will. The second of these gentlemen admitted that he had conversed with Mr. Sheil on the subject of the state of Ireland, and that he had mentioned the conversation to Lord Althorp; but added that he did not attach the least importance to the statement when he made it; and that so far from his having said that Mr. Sheil's private opinions were at variance with his public ones, he had declared that Mr. Sheil had strongly *condemned* the Coercion Bill in the very conversation alluded to.

Seeing, then, that the two witnesses first called, gave testimony so completely at variance with what had been expected—(for unless other evidence than this had been expected from them it were useless to have called them at all)—Mr. Hill at once abandoned the case, admitted his error, and made the best reparation to Mr. Sheil in his power.

Mr. Grote, the Chairman of the Committee, brought up the Report on Friday evening, at the close of the discussion on Lord Althorp's financial statement; and it was read, at length, from the table, by Mr. Lay, the Chief Clerk, while the deepest and most unbroken attention was paid from all parts of the House. The Report was as follows:

THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES, to whom the matter of complaint was referred, arising out of a paragraph in the Examiner Newspaper, dated November 10, 1833, have agreed upon, and do hereby submit to your Honourable House the following Report:

The paragraph in question, purporting to form part of the Report of a Speech publicly delivered by Matthew Davenport Hill, Esq., Member of Parliament for the Borough of Hull, is as follows:

"It is impossible for those not actually in the House to know all the secret machinery by which votes are obtained. I happen to know this: (and I could appeal, if necessary, to a person well known and much respected by yourselves) that an Irish Member who spoke with great violence against every part of that Bill, and voted against every clause of it, went to Ministers and said, 'I don't bate one single atom of that Bill, or it will be impossible for any man to live in Ireland.' 'What (said they), this from you who speak and vote against the Bill?' 'Yes (he replied), that is necessary, because, if I don't come into Parliament for Ireland, I must be out altogether, and that I don't choose.' (*Cries of Name, and No.*) Consider for a moment; can I do it? (*No—Yes.*) That is a point for my consideration. I have a great respect for every one here; but if every one in the room was to hold up his hand for it I would not do it. The secret is not my own. If he had told it to me, I would have said, 'Ma'am I'll keep no such secret as this: I will publish it to the world.' But if I name the Member, I put it in the power of the individual who made that declaration to know the gentleman who told me."

Your Committee in entering on the delicate and embarrassing duty imposed upon them, ascertained from Mr. Hill, that though he could not admit the entire accuracy of the above paragraph, as a report of what he had publicly spoken at Hull, he nevertheless recollected to have publicly charged an Irish Member of Parliament with conduct similar in substance to that which the paragraph describes. The Irish Member so alluded to was Richard Lalor Sheil, Esq., Member of Parliament for the County of Tipperary: and Mr. Hill states the charge, to the best of his belief, to have been substantially as follows:

That Mr. Sheil made communications respecting the Irish Coercion Bill to persons connected with the Government and others, with the intention thereby of promoting the passing of the Coercion Bill, and having a direct tendency to produce that effect, whilst his speeches and votes in the House were directed to the defeat of the Coercion Bill.

Such was the substance of the allegation into which your Committee proceeded to inquire. Two witnesses were called before them at the suggestion of Mr. Hill, and others were about to be examined, when Mr. Hill himself, finding the testimony already heard very different from what he had expected, freely and spontaneously made the following communication to the Committee:

That he had come to the conviction that his charge against Mr. Sheil, of having directly or indirectly communicated, or intended to communicate to the Government any private opinions in opposition to those which he expressed in the House of Commons, had no foundation in fact; that such charge was not merely incapable of formal proof, but was, in his present sincere belief, totally and absolutely unfounded; that he had originally been induced to make mention of it in a hasty and unpremeditated speech, under a firm persuasion that he had received it on undeniable evidence; but that being now satisfied of the mistake into which he had fallen, and convinced that the charge was wholly untrue, he came forward to express his deep and unfeigned sorrow for having ever contributed to give it circulation. Mr. Hill added, that if there were any way, consistent with honour, by which he could make reparation to Mr. Sheil, he should deem no sacrifice too great to heal the wound which his erroneous statement had inflicted.

It is with the highest gratification that your Committee find themselves enabled thus to exonerate an accused Member of Parliament from imputations so painful and undeserved. The voluntary avowal of an erroneous statement on the part of Mr. Hill, puts it now in their power to pronounce a decided opinion, and to close the present inquiry. Neither of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee deposed to any facts calculated to bear out the allegation against Mr. Sheil; nor did their testimony go to impeach his character and honour in any way, or as to any matter whatever. The Committee have no hesitation in declaring their deliberate conviction that the innocence of Mr. Sheil, in respect of

the whole matter of complaint referred to their investigation, is entire and unquestionable.

Your Committee feel bound at the same time to express their full confidence in Mr. Hill's declaration, that the statement impeaching Mr. Sheil's character, was made by him at Hull, under a sincere, though mistaken, persuasion of its accuracy. They derive this confidence as well from the tone of generous regret which characterised his communication at the close of their proceeding, as from the candid admissions, and the evident anxiety to avoid all exaggeration, and mis-statement, which they have observed throughout his testimony, as delivered in their presence.

A short discussion followed this; but as much of it was irrelevant, we content ourselves with giving the speeches of Lord Althorp and Mr. Sheil, as the only important ones.

LORD ALTHORP then came forward, but spoke in a low tone of voice, which rendered him almost inaudible in the gallery. We understood him to express himself to the following effect:—I know not why I should be called upon to rise in my place after the report which has just been read to the house. Rising, however, as I now do, after it has been read, I feel bound to say that no man present rejoices more at its contents than I do. (Hear, hear.) The charge as stated in the paper, which was referred to the consideration of the select committee, was, that the hon. and learned member for Tipperary had made a communication to the members of his Majesty's Government, and also to other persons, with a view which was specifically mentioned in the report. The answer which I first gave to the question put to me by the hon. and learned member for Dublin was, as the house will recollect, that there was no foundation for any such charge. I then stated upon the authority of a person on whose veracity I placed entire reliance, that though such a charge had no foundation in fact, I had reason to believe, and I did believe, that the hon. and learned gentleman whom I afterwards named, had expressed in private respecting the Coercion Bill sentiments very different from those which he professed in public. I feel that, after what has taken place in the committee, it is due from me to this house, and I may also add to myself, to state frankly the reasons why I added the latter observation. I had seen in the public papers very strong attacks made upon my hon. and learned friend the member for Hull for the speech which he had addressed to his constituents. I was quite sure that the questions put to me by the hon. and learned member for Dublin were put to me with a view of following up in this house the attacks which had been made elsewhere upon my hon. and learned friend, and I felt that if I had stopped short and had answered the question simply, I should have made a statement which would have been contrary to what I had reason to believe, and which would have supported and encouraged the attacks on my hon. and learned friend, which we all knew were in contemplation. (Hear, hear.) I believe that at the time it was thought that in acting as I did, I acted rightly; but I am now inclined to admit, upon subsequent consideration, that I acted wrongly (hear, hear)—nay, that I acted imprudently as a man, and still more imprudently as a minister. (Hear, hear.) With respect to what I did in my character as an individual, I admit that I may have acted hastily; but in a case where I am actuated by the reasons which then influenced me, I frankly confess that I would rather be found fault with for having acted with too little than for having acted with too much prudence. (Hear, hear.) My conduct, I am also inclined to admit was imprudent, perhaps very imprudent, as a minister; but if I am to put into competition my conduct and character as a man with my conduct and character as a minister, I must say that I shall look at the first with more regard than I shall look at the latter. (Hear, hear.)

I am now called upon by several hon. gentlemen to state what my opinion is, now that I have heard the report of the committee read. As to the facts to which the report refers, I have no scruple at all in saying that I am satisfied with it. (Hear, hear.) I have also no scruple in saying that the hon. and learned gentleman never did, directly, or indirectly, intentionally, or actually, communicate to other persons any opinions in favour of the Coercion Bill, which were to be

communicated by them to His Majesty's Government. (Hear, hear.) I know also that the hon. and learned gentleman did not communicate any such opinions to the Government himself. (Hear, hear.) The communication which I received on the subject came from persons on whose veracity I entirely rely. The hon. and learned gentleman, in denial of the statement which I offered to the house, did not, as it appeared to me, deny the truth of the communication which was made to me. I intend to say nothing disparaging to any man in this house when I say, that in loose conversation hon. members may have expressed sentiments to a certain degree varying from the tenour of their votes in the house. At the same time, I do not pretend to deny that the expression of sentiments in private, directly adverse to the sentiments expressed by hon. members in the house, is a disparagement to them. (Hear, hear.) I have, since I last addressed the house, made inquiries respecting the information given to me on this subject, and I am now prepared to say, if the hon. and learned member for Tipperary asserts distinctly that he has not done what I stated him to have done, that I believe his assertion. (Hear, hear.) At present I am in this situation—I have had certain information given to me on the authority of gentlemen on whose veracity I entirely rely. They may have been mistaken in what they stated to me. They stated to me distinctly that which I stated to the house (hear, hear); but if the hon. and learned member for Tipperary will now come forward and say that it is untrue that he ever used language in private different from that which he used in public on the Coercion Bill, I will not only say that I entirely believe him, but I will also apologize to him for the language which I used. (Hear, hear.) Whilst I am now upon my legs, though the question is not now regularly before the house, I trust that I may be permitted to make another statement. On this the first opportunity which I have had since I addressed the house on this subject, I feel bound to say, that, having on the former occasion stated that more than one Irish member had made similar communications to members of His Majesty's Government, I conceived it to be my duty to communicate with my informant, and I have now to acquaint the house, that though my words on that occasion are liberally borne out by his information, the impression which it produced on my mind, and which I may have produced in consequence upon the house, is not borne out. (Hear, hear.)

The SPEAKER was then proceeding to put the question, when there were loud and incessant cries for Mr. Sheil.

Mr. SHEIL at last came forward, and addressed the house to the following effect:—That I have been so completely exonerated upon one charge at least that was preferred against me, must be evident to every man who heard the evidence submitted to the committee. The hon. and learned member for Hull, after examining two witnesses in the committee,—for the committee had left the conduct of this prosecution, if I may be permitted to use such an expression, to him and to him alone,—the hon. and learned member for Hull had stated to the committee, in a manner the best calculated to make me reparation, that he felt not only that his charge against me was not proved, but also that it was destitute of all foundation. As soon as the hon. and learned member had come to that conclusion he turned to me with an expression of strong emotion, and said that he hoped that I would forgive him for the wrong which he had done me. (Hear, hear.) The very moment those words passed his lips, I told him that resentment was not an ingredient in my character, and that after his acknowledgement I freely and frankly forgave him. (Loud cheering.) That he had put into circulation a grievous charge against me—that he had attempted to establish it in the face of the assembled Commons of this great empire—and that he had signally failed in that attempt, is admitted by the hon. and learned gentleman himself, and in a manner that in my mind appears calculated to do him great honour. (Hear, hear.) In reference to what passed between myself and the noble lord on the other side of the house, I hope that hon. gentleman will do me the justice to recollect that I shrunk from no part of this discussion. (Hear.) The house will, I trust, do me the justice to recollect also, that not only I did not object to inquiry, but that I even respectfully requested it—nay more, demanded it (loud cheers), in spite of the warnings terrifically but unnecessarily held out to me on

the other side. (Hear, hear.) I stood on the verge of the precipice without dismay (cheers), and being now removed from it, I trust that I shall show as little exultation as I then showed fear. (Cheers.) I courted inquiry by every means in my power. My denial was not limited to the allegation against me made by the hon. and learned member for Hull—that was the original charge. A Minister had charged the Irish members in his speech with expressing a different opinion out of doors from that which they had thought proper to express in the house. Was not every Irish member implicated in that charge? If, indeed, the noble lord had answered by a simple negative to the question first proposed to him, there would have been an end of the matter; but he did not stop there, but, without apparently any purpose, any intention, he declared that more than one Irish member had expressed opinions there different from those he had expressed in public.

It is not for me to say what might have been the subjects of private conversations or after-dinner discourses. On such subjects I would touch with extreme jealousy, not so much on my own account as on that of others. But what did I answer in return to the accusation? I said that in no instance whatever had I expressed opinions out of this house different from those I had advocated in it. (Hear, hear.) If it be said that I assented, that I acquiesced, in private in the opinion, that from the dreadful condition of Ireland, for the sake of preserving peace and order,—if, I say, I am accused of asserting that something must be done, why I freely admit this. It is what I have repeatedly done. Indeed, the very report of the Queen's County Commission would have warranted the expression of such an opinion. I repeat, I have only said out of the house what I have said in the house. Surely there is not one amongst us all who would not concur in the sentiment. What matters whether I stated so much at Brook's, or at the Athenæum? I ask any man whether such an assertion is tantamount to the allegation of my favouring the Coercion Bill? Never, never will I admit such a conclusion. Why, two members on the committee were prepared to prove that in private I ever expressed the strongest objection to it. The hon. member for Edinburgh,—he will pardon my allusion to him, he said that he believed the conversation to have occurred. I ask him what he then thought of the state of Ireland? And is it necessary that I should have recourse to the sweepings of the clubs and coffee-houses, in order to show that the tenor of his opinions has been uniform? Must I take advantage of every casual expression of an hon. member? Must I take a note of his after-dinner conversation, and then produce his unguarded expressions in array against him? Is there one member of this house, is there one Minister who could submit to such an ordeal? The noble lord has said, that as I have denied the allegation, he is bound to believe my word. I accept his apology. But how could I have refrained from entering the lists in defence of my character? How when on every hand I was assailed, when the newspapers for months had made a trade of traducing my character? It is true I was warned not to press the question, a question dearer to me than life itself; but, though it be painful in the extreme, let any man make the case his own (and the hypothesis is not so strong a one), and say whether he could have acted differently. I have only to say that I accept the apology made to me. I accept it as made without reservation, without insinuation, and if I were on my death-bed, I should fearlessly, and before my God, deny the charge. (Hear, hear.)

After this, we trust the subject will never again be re-opened or even referred to from any quarter. The public time and public attention ought never to have been devoted to its investigation by the House of Commons; but the result is so satisfactory to the accused, that for his sake all the lovers of justice will be glad that the investigation has been so public, and the acquittal so complete.

## NAVY ESTIMATES FOR THE YEAR.—SALARIES OF PUBLIC OFFICERS.

THE Navy Estimates were brought forward by Sir James Graham, on Monday evening, in a speech of great clearness, which gave, we think, very general satisfaction. Objections were taken to the amount of men voted, by Mr. Hume, and Mr. Cobbett; but the feeling of the House was strongly expressed by the many independent Members, not usually voting with the Government, who supported the First Lord of the Admiralty in his views. It can be hardly necessary, we think, for us to assure our readers that we hold Economy to be one of the very first duties of every Government, because the funds they administer are not their own, but are placed in their hands, as trustees, to dispose of in the most scrupulously careful manner possible; so that either waste or misappropriation of them is a crime against the commonwealth. At the same time we also hold that Efficiency is equally as important as Economy; and that as much waste may be effected by having an inadequate supply of the materials of defence, as by a surplus. If a case be required in proof, we need only refer to the defeats sustained by our Navy, in the last short American war, where frigate after frigate was captured, because they were inefficiently manned and equipped; and to repeated instances of the shipwreck of vessels of war, in former times, from the want of men and materials to fit them for weathering a heavy gale. We hold, therefore, that while the smallest extent of force should be employed, compatible with the protection of our maritime commerce, that force should be kept in the most efficient state for actual service: and in this point of view we think Sir James Graham's Estimates are judiciously framed; and, under the peculiar circumstances of the country, not at all beyond what our safety as a great commercial nation requires. We give his own reasoning on this subject, in his own words:

Sir J. GRAHAM said, that in rising to move the first vote in the navy estimates, he could not refrain from congratulating the committee upon the satisfactory prospect which accompanied the commencement of the financial year. The hon. member for Oldham having alluded to the repeal of taxes, he (Sir J. Graham) would venture, before he proceeded further, to call the attention of the committee to the extent to which of late years the reduction of taxation had really been carried. He must now, as he had done on a former occasion, urge upon the committee the justice and necessity of considering attentively the financial situation of the country at the time the present Administration succeeded that of the Duke of Wellington. At that time the expenditure of the country had been reduced by great and honest efforts of well-regulated economy in the different departments of the state to about 50,000,000*l.* *Of these 50,000,000*l.* not less than 35,000,000*l.* consisted of items over which the executive Government, whatever its desire to economize, possessed no controul.* These items consisted of the interest of the debt, the half-pay of the army and navy, and the retired allowances of public servants. There remained then only a surplus of 15,000,000*l.* with which the Government could deal. The Duke of Wellington's Administration

repealed taxes to the amount of 3,200,000*l.*, that reduction having been rendered possible by a co-equal reduction of expenditure. In the three years during which the present Administration had been in power a reduction of expenditure nearly equal in amount to that effected by the Duke of Wellington's Administration had taken place—that was to say, the 15,000,000*l.* of surplus had been reduced to about 12,000,000*l.* or 20 per cent. on the whole sum on which Government could operate, and this had been accompanied by the remission of taxes to more than that amount. The amount of taxes reduced by the present Ministry was 3,300,000*l.*, which, added to the 3,200,000*l.* repealed by the Duke of Wellington in the last year of his administration, presented a gross amount of 6,500,000*l.* of taxes repealed in the course of the last four years. He begged the committee to reflect upon this statement. The remission of taxes had been the result of a gradual and temperate economical reform. This reform had been gradual and temperate, and therefore effectual; it would not have been effectual had it not been systematic, and unless it had been systematic it could not have been permanent. Although there had been a reduction of expenditure to the extent of 20 per cent. during the last three years, he was happy to say that in the estimates about to be proposed for this year by the Government it had been able to effect a reduction to the amount of 500,000*l.*, as stated by his noble friend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on Friday night. If the house would refer back to the estimates which had been laid before it since the accession of the present administration to office, it would find, that in consequence of having found it necessary to increase the quantity of staple commodities in the King's stores, and to fit up a number of steam-vessels for war, he had not hesitated to increase the estimates of 1830 beyond the amount of those of the Duke of Wellington in the preceding year. The house had confidence in the pledge of Government, and did vote the increase.

He stated on that occasion that the best efforts of the Government would be made to reduce the estimates to the lowest possible scale. He would now call on the committee to bear witness that Ministers had not been wanting in their efforts to redeem that pledge. Reductions to the amount of more than a million had been already made in the navy estimates, in addition to which there was this year a further reduction of 181,000*l.*; so that the whole of the reductions to this time by the present Government were not less than 1,200,000*l.* (Hear, hear.) He did not feel it necessary to go through the whole of the items on which the reductions this year had been effected. The principal were in the dock-yards, in which, by a change in the system of labour and in the mode of payment, the number of workmen had been reduced to 6000. The former Government had commenced and carried on gradually, and therefore safely, reductions in this respect; and by following up that plan, the reductions had now been made to the extent he had stated, by which a saving of 22,000*l.* had been made on an outlay of 400,000*l.* Another charge on which a considerable reduction had been made was the allowance in the margin of the estimates, which made an increase of 10 per cent. on the estimates for victualling and other stores, to cover any increase that might arise in the price of provisions. He had found that this sum of 10 per cent. was more than was required, as there was always a sum in hand on this charge at the end of the year. He therefore reduced the charge to 5 per cent., by which a reduction was made to the amount of 42,000*l.* Another saving, which he was sure the house would hear with satisfaction, had been made by following out a plan introduced by the late Ministry. This was on the amount of the half-pay. For every three vacancies which took place by the death of officers, or their removal by courts-martial, only one place was filled up. This in the whole had made a saving of 65,000*l.*; and in the present year the amount thus saved was between 24,000*l.* and 25,000*l.* There were many other items which went to make up the whole sum of 181,000*l.*, but which he did not feel it necessary to detail. This sum would make the whole saving on the navy estimates, since 1831, amount to a sum of 1,400,000*l.* (Hear, hear.)

In the number of seamen to be kept up this year, he proposed a reduction of 500; but at the same time an increase of 1000 boys. This was advisedly done.



*The subject had been noticed in the last session, and as far as the trial had gone, had borne out what had been stated of the advantage of training up boys to become able seamen.* This, he thought, would meet the approbation of the Committee, as the rearing up of boys for the navy in that way would be found to be much more effectual way of recruiting the navy than that of forcible service. (Cheers.) The expense of 17,500 men and 1000 boys would not be found, as far as regarded wages, more than the charge of 18,000 seamen; but it would occasion some slight difference in the charge for victualling. Referring to the whole amount of the naval force to be kept up, he felt that he was addressing a deliberative assembly, which he hoped had confidence in the Government, so as to believe, that even in the present state of peace in Europe, we could not do with a less effective naval establishment than that now proposed. He hoped the house would not discuss the reasons which induced the Government to keep up such an establishment. With every disposition to economy in every department, consistently with the efficiency of that department, Ministers felt that they ought not to have a less effective force, to keep up the character of this country as the first naval power in the world. (Hear, hear.) He hoped the house would pass the vote for the effective service with unanimity, by which the moral force of the vote would be greatly strengthened in the eyes of Europe. (Cheers.) Under these circumstances, he would not trespass further on the committee, but would now move that 27,500 men, including 9000 marines and 1000 boys, be voted for the sea service of the year 1834.

\* There are two points in this speech especially deserving attention. the first is, the assertion that out of the fifty millions of expenditure which the Government were called upon to make, no less a sum than thirty-five millions, or nearly three-fourths of the whole were so fixed, by the interest of the debt, dead weight, and pensions, that no Ministry could touch it, leaving, therefore, only fifteen millions on which any sort of reduction could be made. This is the obstacle that meets every proposition for retrenchment; and we are more and more confirmed by it in the opinion long ago expressed by us, and again and again repeated, that until some plan is devised for the gradual extinction of that immense debt, and the progressive diminution of its principal and interest, it will be in vain to hope for any essential relief from the public burdens.

The second point is that which announces the gratifying change of entering boys and training them up for the Navy, instead of impressing men into forcible service. Sir James Graham says truly, that this subject was noticed during the last Session: he did not say by whom: but we may remind our readers that in the speech made by us against Impressment, on the 15th of August, last year, this plan of training up boys for the Navy was recommended by us as one of the modes by which the requisite supply of men might be secured without Impressment. And we are happy to find that the trial has answered all the good which we predicted. It has been the mode used in the mercantile shipping from time immemorial: it is the mode adopted in all trades and professions on land; and it ought to be adopted as the best, the cheapest, and the most efficient way of obtaining and preparing men for the Army and Navy.

We give the three following speeches as those of Members not usually voting with the Government, to show the sense entertained by them of the Estimates in question; the two first, Mr. Young, and Mr. Cutlar Fergusson, men difficult to be classed with any party, but as often opposed to, as voting with the Government, the two next,

Captain Yorke, one of the highest Tories in the House; Mr. Chapman, a Tory of a more moderate order; and lastly, Mr. Lloyd, as decided a Liberal as any man on the Opposition benches.

Mr. G. F. YOUNG said, that though he could not boast of 50 years' experience in that house, and though even he could not boast of being such a veteran there as his hon. friend behind him, yet still he hoped that he had had sufficient experience to enable him to say that much of the moral force possessed by the naval power of this country was due to the system under which the British navy had hitherto been governed, and he confessed he saw but little ground for changing that system in the speech of his hon. friend behind him—a speech which was but a repetition of that which he had delivered on the same subject last year, and which was by no means an answer to the statement of the right hon. baronet at the other side of the house. From those sources of information from which he was peculiarly conversant, he was enabled to say that the navy was not made the object of such lavish expenditure as had been asserted. He should give all the assistance in his power to promote every measure of a wise and advantageous economy, but oppose a short-sighted and niggardly mode of conducting public affairs.

Mr. C. FERGUSON said, that if ever there was an occasion when it behoved the people of this country to see that their means of national defence was in a sound and effective condition, the present was that time. He thought the Government entitled to the fullest confidence of the house, so far as the present estimates, they being such as the necessities of the present times demanded, and such as would enable the British nation to put forth its strength in a manner suitable to any of the possible or probable emergencies that might arise. He need not point more particularly to the quarter in which the putting forth of that strength might soonest be needed, but of this he felt assured, that no pains ought to be spared to preserve our naval force in such a condition as would enable it to meet that emergency whenever and wherever it might arise. In looking at the estimates, he could not but notice with regret the omission of one name—he alluded to that of Captain Ross, one of the boldest navigators Great Britain had ever sent forth, and a man who by his discoveries had added largely to the physical science, and, above all, to the geographical knowledge of the age in which he lived. He really was entitled not only to honorary distinction in the service to which he belonged, but to pecuniary reward, and he therefore wished to state that it was his intention to move on a future occasion that some pecuniary grant be made by Parliament to that distinguished individual.

Captain YORKE felt gratified at having to perform the pleasant duty of complimenting the Government upon the present estimate; it was upon the whole well judged, and he felt that in so far as it was objectionable it had been made so by the pressure from abroad, rather than from any conviction on the part of the right hon. baronet of its necessity, and upon the whole he had no difficulty in saying that the estimate then before them reflected great credit upon the present Administration. He felt the more strongly upon that subject, from a full persuasion that the efficient condition of the navy would contribute more than all the acts of diplomacy to preserve and consolidate the peace of Europe.

Mr. A. CHAPMAN thanked the Government for doing so much, and gave the estimate his most cordial support.

Mr. LLOYD agreed with the last speaker that the present time was not the fit opportunity for reducing the naval force of the country. He was not the man to give a blind confidence to any Administration—a reasonable confidence was that to which he thought every Administration entitled—and he had on the present occasion no difficulty in saying that the condition of affairs abroad fully justified him in saying that to support the present estimate was nothing more than giving Ministers a reasonable confidence. The naval force of the country was its best and most popular defence, and infinitely more efficient than all the arts of diplomacy.

After a further discussion the amendment of Mr. Hume for reducing

the number of men was put to the vote and lost; the division being, For the original number proposed, 196; For the amendment, 20.

When this was disposed of, Mr. Ruthven moved that the Board of Admiralty should be reduced from five to three in number, and that the salary of the First Lord should be reduced from 4500*l.* to 4000*l.* a-year. This was opposed by Mr. Aylshford Sandford, on the ground that Sir James Graham's salary was already 500*l.* a-year less than that of any other Cabinet Minister; and considering that his department was the one of all others in the Government in which the greatest retrenchment, consolidations, and improvements had been effected, it was invidious to single him out especially for a still further reduction. We think so too; and although we should have the greatest pleasure in supporting any general measure of reduction in the salaries of all the great Officers of State in some equal ratio for all, we think the singling out the head of the best-conducted department in the State, as the solitary example to be made, is as unjust as it is ungenerous. This proposition was put to the vote; and on a division the numbers were, For continuing the present salary, 160; For reducing it by the sum proposed, 29.

Upon the whole, we think the Estimates, as far as they have been presented, have been framed on a scale of as much economy as the efficiency of the public service will allow; and though there may be many improvements yet made in particular departments, we must say that we have no very sanguine hopes of much relief being effected in this respect. The great resources of the country lie in her capital, her manufacturing skill, and her maritime superiority. Let these be fully developed, by the removal of all restraints on trade, by an abolition of all imposts on commodities of general consumption, and by a revised system of taxation; and we should be better able to raise a hundred million a-year than we now are to expend fifty.

#### FITNESS OF MEN FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT.

As he that knows how to put proper words in proper places evinces the truest knowledge of books, so he that knows how to put fit persons in fit stations, evinces the truest knowledge of men. It was observed of Elizabeth, that she was weak herself, but chose wise counsellors; to which it was replied, that to choose wise counsellors was in a prince the highest wisdom.—*Lacon*.

#### DIFFERENCES OF PRICES IN CORN IN LONDON, PARIS, AND HAMBURGH.

On the 31st of October last, the highest price of the finest wheaten flour was 48 francs per 150 kilogrammes, equal to 1*l.* 10*s.* 3*d.* the English sack of 280*lbs.*; and the highest price of wheaten flour of the finest quality in London is 2*l.* 10*s.* the sack. Therefore wheaten flour is full 65 per cent. dearer in London than in Paris. 2*l.* 10*s.* will buy 463*lbs.* of fine flour in Paris, and only 280*lbs.* in London. And whilst 3*l.* will buy, in London, 8 bushels of wheat only, the same sum will buy, in Paris, 12½ bushels. The mean price of white and red wheat at Hamburgh, on the 12th of January last, was 1*l.* 9*s.* 10*d.* imperial quarter, whilst in Mark-lane it was 2*l.* 17*s.*, or 91 per cent. dearer in London than in Hamburgh.

## REPEAL OF THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL IMPOSING NEW DUTIES ON THE CHINA TRADE.

---

IN the month of December last, while we were at the port of Whitehaven in Cumberland, there appeared in the *London Gazette* a series of Orders in Council, relating to the future conditions of the China Trade, which struck us then as so highly injurious to the mercantile and shipping interests of Great Britain, that there, and at every other place visited in our route homeward, we took occasion to expose the injurious tendency of these Orders in Council, and urged on the merchants and shipowners of all the towns visited to unite and petition for their repeal. In THE PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW for January last, the first number that appeared after the Orders in Council were promulgated, their impolicy and injustice were pointed out in the following terms :

Immediately after this, comes the Orders of the King in Council, issued at Brighton on the 9th of November, wherein among other things are the following provisions : 1. That the Superintendent, when taking office at the expiration of the India Company's charter, in April, 1834, shall succeed to all the powers heretofore enjoyed by the Company's supercargoes of fining, imprisoning, and banishing those who may offend their authority, and of passing such regulations as he may think proper for the carrying on the trade. 2. That a duty of 2s. per ton is to be levied on all British ships, entering or departing, whether laden or in ballast. 3. That a duty of 7s. 6d. per cent. on the value of all goods imported or exported is to be levied on the cargoes. 4. That the ship or ship-master is to be held liable for the payment of both. 5. That these imposts are for the maintenance of the Superintendent, LORD NAPIER, and his necessary establishment.

It is difficult to say which of all these five parts is the most objectionable. The first is a gross insult to all British subjects, who on the opening of the China Trade had a right to expect that these odious powers of the Company's supercargoes would be abolished; and every facility and protection be afforded to all who might enter into it. The others are such clogs and hindrances to British ships and merchandise, as will be certain to throw the whole of the maritime conveyance into the hands of foreigners, as will be seen from the following calculation :

If a merchant in London or Liverpool be about to ship for Canton an investment of the value of 50,000*l.*, and a British and an American ship should be loading at the same time, in either of these ports, the charge of 7s. 6d. per cent. on the value of his goods would amount to 187*l.* 10*s.*, and it is perfectly clear that if, by making his shipment in the American vessel, he can evade this payment, he will do so, unless the British shipowner would accept an equivalent reduction in his freight. In addition to the 187*l.* 10*s.* on the goods, there would be 50*l.* on the ship, at 2*s.* per ton on a ship of five hundred tons, which together would be 237*l.* 10*s.*, or 9*s.* 6d. per ton, on the outward freight, a bonus to the foreigner, which would soon place the whole carrying trade from England to China in the hands of foreign competitors.

The same reason will apply to the carrying trade between China and the continent of Europe. A ship of five hundred tons would carry about six hundred tons measurement, equal to about three hundred tons, or 672,000 pounds weight of tea. Estimating the price of the tea at 1*s.* 3d. per pound, the value of such a

cargo would be 42,000*l.*; and as a portion of it would probably consist either of tea of a higher price, or of silks, or other valuable commodities, it may be reasonably calculated at 50,000*l.* The imposts on the value of such a cargo, together with that on the tonnage of the ship, would, as in the former case, amount to 9*s.* 6*d.* per ton, which being payable on shipment in a British, but not in a foreign vessel, would be a direct *premium* to the latter, amounting probably to not less than 7½ per cent. on the whole freight, a disqualification against which, when added to those to which they are at present exposed, it would be impossible for British shipowners to contend.

Now, when it is considered that the great grievance of the China monopoly in the hands of the Company was, that it admitted foreign vessels to enjoy advantages over British ones—as to the former, the trade was open, while to the latter it was closed—it does seem a mockery and an insult to clog the very first operations under the new India Bill by a tax that perpetuates this disadvantage in another shape, and throws the whole of this advantage into foreign hands. And when the British merchant asks *why* this is done, the only answer is—“To maintain the Ex-Lord of the Bedchamber, and now Superintendent of the Trade with China, Lord NAPIER, and his necessary establishments in the East.” We will only add, that if the Shipowners and Merchants of England do not revolt at this, they deserve to be swamped in the China seas, and never more be permitted to hoist the British flag, which however victorious in war, is here obliged to quail and lower its lofty pennants before the superior freedom of foreigners of every other nation under the sun.

We rejoice to find that our efforts on this subject have not been in vain; and that the Memorials, the Petitions, and the Newspaper comments which have been subsequently called into action against these Orders in Council, have had such effect, that the Ministers have formally announced their intention of abandoning them; and thus relieving the China Trade as carried on in British ships from burdens that nothing but extreme ignorance would ever have suggested the imposition of. The preparations in the outports will now be renewed with vigour; and we hope to see no more of the imbecility that could dictate such a course of policy as this, which is now happily abandoned as altogether untenable.

#### INCREASED CONSUMPTION OF ARDENT SPIRITS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

In 1823, 1824, and 1825, when the Duty on British Spirits was in Scotland 6*s.* 2*d.*, and in England 12*s.* per gallon, the annual consumption was 7,555,666 gallons.

In 1826, 1827, and 1828, when the Duty was reduced in Scotland to 2*s.* 10*d.* and in England to 7*s.* per gallon, the annual consumption was increased to 18,337,857 gallons.

#### TRUE LIBERTY.

THIS is true liberty when free-born men  
Having to advise the public, may speak out,  
Which he who can and will, deserves high praise;  
Who neither can nor will, may hold his peace;  
What can be juster in a state than this?

*Euripides.*

## DISCUSSION ON THE PENSION LIST—NATURE AND EXTENT OF ROYAL BOUNTY.

---

THE most animated and most important discussion that has taken place for the Session was that which occurred on Tuesday the 18th, on the motion of Mr. Harvey, for referring the Pension List to a Select Committee, to inquire into the particulars of each grant, and to report their opinion thereon to the House. The attendance of members was unusually large, there being at the commencement nearly four hundred present; and it was known that the greatest pains had been taken by the Ministry to marshal all their forces for resistance to this motion, by circulars addressed to all their adherents, who were gathered in from every accessible quarter. The debate did not open till about eight o'clock, after Mr. O'Connell had obtained leave to bring in a Bill for improving the Law of Libel, and better securing the Liberty of the Press (a subject which we shall have other opportunities of discussing as the bill passes through the House), and it continued till twelve o'clock. The speakers on either side were: For the motion, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Hume, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Divett, Mr. Robinson, Sir Samuel Whalley, Mr. E. Ruthven, Sir Edward Codrington, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Hardy: Against the motion, Lord Althorp, Lord Ebrington, Mr. Spring Rice, Sir Robert Inglis, Mr. Secretary Stanley, Sir Robert Peel, and Mr. Halcomb. The Tories mustered strongly in support of the Government; and their most powerful defenders were, indeed, Sir Robert Inglis and Sir Robert Peel. But for the alliance of this party, the Ministers would have been beaten by an overwhelming majority; as it will be seen, on reference to the Division List, which we publish in our present number, that many of their habitual supporters and adherents found it necessary to desert them on this occasion and go out with the minority in support of Mr. Harvey's motion. The speeches were extremely unequal: Mr. Harvey's opening and reply were both admirable, and Mr. O'Connell's and Mr. Roebuck's aid effective: there were no other speeches on the same side worth repeating. Lord Althorp's defence was even worse than usual. Mr. Spring Rice's advocacy most laboured and heavy; Mr. Secretary Stanley's address made under evident feelings of the difficulty of obtaining assent to his propositions; Lord Morpeth's speech, well conceived and well delivered, but apologetical and casuistical throughout; Sir Robert Inglis's a good exposition of monarchical and Tory principles; and Sir Robert Peel's a pathetic appeal to the feelings rather than to the judgment of the House. All would not do, however: the strong holds of the Government were fortified in vain; and the result was considered in the House, and will be regarded by the country, as a complete defeat of Ministers on this question; so that when Mr. Harvey shall bring for-

VOL. I.—SESSION OF 1834.

ward the question again, in another shape, which he has announced his intention to do, during the present session, and to move a call of the House upon the occasion, we shall see still more defalcations from the ministerial ranks, and still more additions to the reforming party, by which the present small minority will be turned into a large majority, and Ministers be compelled to yield to the power of public opinion.

Having named the whole of the speakers on both sides of the House, and given the list of the divisions in another place, we make a selection of some of the principal passages of the principal speeches, so as to present the cream and essence of the debate to our readers, without giving the more tedious and wearisome portions, which may well be spared without disadvantage to the full and complete understanding of the whole bearing of the question.

Mr. HARVEY, pursuant to notice, brought forward his motion for a select committee to inquire into each grant on the pension list, and report the same with observations to the house. If he were governed by such considerations as might influence some upon an occasion like that, he should, instead of addressing the house at much length, content himself with simply making his motion, and calling upon noble lords and right hon. gentlemen opposite to stand up in their places and justify the present condition of that list, a course that would not perhaps embarrass them much more than if, by going into the question in detail, he enabled those who were on the watch for such opportunities to catch at every particular case, and make it the groundwork of most pathetic appeals. Those earnest advocates of high station and fashionable ascendancy would exclaim, "What! do you propose to let the valuable services of this person or of that go unrewarded; will you take her pension from Lady A. or Lady B.?" But, though exposed probably to those attacks, and though aware that the notes from the Treasury earnestly requested the attendance of hon. members, and though those summonses had been almost universally obeyed, bringing on the benches opposite to him an array such as in other circumstances might well appal the stoutest member of an opposition, yet he felt that upon that occasion he had not only an important duty to perform, but very strong ground upon which to take his stand. He felt himself entitled to call upon every member in that house to fulfil then the engagements he made at the last election with his constituents, for if there was one subject more than another on which the feelings of the country were deeply engaged, it was the amount and names on the pension list. Demands upon that subject had for a time been suspended by the discussions on the Reform Act, but hon. members greatly deceived themselves if they thought that the delusions which they might practise for a period of seven years between one parliament and another would take the minds of the people off that important question, or abate one jot of the interest with which it was invested. The people had not forgotten that by the pension list the late Government was overturned, and the present brought into office. It would be in the recollection of the house that upon the memorable division in November, 1830, when the then Chancellor of the Exchequer moved the sum of 144,000*l.* for the payment of the civil list, that the right hon. baronet who at present represented Dundee moved an amendment, that that amendment was successful, and that thereupon the present Administration was formed, the basis of its accession to power being an improvement in the plan and principles upon which that list had been formed—they came into power with a pledge to the people that every one of those grants should be scrutinized. As he had already said, the proceedings upon the Reform Bill occasioned delay, but with that delay the firm resolves and the cool deliberation of the people became strengthened. Amidst all the excitement which the Reform Bill occasioned, both in and out of the house, the object of the pension list was never once lost sight of. Reform had at length been attained; they had achieved a triumph, and he now desired that they should reap the benefits of that triumph. When he had heard that his motion was to be opposed, he confessed it did fill his mind with astonishment, and he could not now look at the

every drawn up against him without almost doubting his own recollection of what took place at the elections throughout the country, and without asking himself whether it could be possible that hon. members were acquainted with the state of public feeling upon that subject. He had already adverted to the advantages which might arise to his motion were he, for the first time, to be a silent mover of an opposition motion. Taciturnity in a member of Opposition would be novel, though when members, noisy enough, from his side got to the other, and that all occasion for speaking was at an end, none could more eminently distinguish themselves by a judicious silence, than those who, but a short time before, were eloquent members of the Opposition. Were he, as he said, to remain silent on such an occasion, he should certainly prevent those declamations in favour of official and fashionable life with which he had no doubt the house would be favoured before the debate was brought to a close, for who would not stand forward as the advocate of those who held the enviable position of leaders of fashion? He left the defence of the list itself to those who saw nothing in his present motion but ungallantry and rudeness, being quite satisfied that they wished a committee, and would be able to show, but for the indecency of the thing, that from the first pensioner to the last, from the oldest dowager down to the youngest beauty, there was not one who had not earned it on substantial, public, and honourable grounds. ("Hear," and a laugh.) Let it not be supposed, though they might express it in uncouth language, though their hands were not stretched forth covered with silken gloves, and though they might not step with all the fashionable gracefulness of the drawing-room, that the laborious classes of this country at all grudged compensation for real merit. (Hear.) No, even though it might have lost something of its lustre by the rust of time (cheers), they would not scornfully deny them the consideration they deserved. The real objection to an unlimited power in Parliament to reward substantial merit was that the generosity of the people would outstrip their resources. There was not a person in the country, however low in fortune, though scarcely able to maintain existence by the united efforts of his mind and body, who was not eager to show his anxiety to reward substantial merit and relieve oppressed indigence. (Hear.) What, then, was the ground on which, if it might be gathered from the floating rumours, it was now proposed to resist his motion? He felt that long since he ought to have ceased troubling the house, and that he should have commenced with the question—were they prepared to stultify their own resolutions? The resolutions, indeed, which the house passed were very many, and they moved with such rapidity before their eyes that they might be presumed not to carry in their minds every vote which they had come to; but upon the occasion in question there could be no forgetfulness, for it must be remembered that in the month of May, last session, he (Mr. Harvey) had moved for a return of each pension, stating the specific amount, the period of its grant, and its consideration, and the noble lord expressed himself ready to grant the motion as far as regarded that portion of it which had been charged on the consolidated fund, but stated at the same time his doubts as to what had been placed on the civil list. But ultimately feeling the force of his original obligation, the noble lord withdrew his opposition, and the motion was passed in the shape of an order. It was true that the noble lord the Paymaster of the Forces (Lord J. Russell) entered the house just too late to interpose his successful resistance (hear); for if he (Mr. Harvey) had not concluded his reply, and if he had been open to the attacks of the noble lord, the great probability was that he (Mr. Harvey) must have been so marred and mangled in the conflict ("Hear," and a laugh), that he should have been well pleased to sign a truce, the condition of which would have been never again to touch the pension list at all. (Much laughter.) Was the house then prepared, he again asked, to abide by its own order? (Hear, hear.) The words of that motion, agreed to on the 22d of May, 1833, in the first session of a reformed Parliament, were these—"Ordered, that an humble address be presented to his Majesty that he will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this house a return of all pensions on the English, Irish, and Scotch pension lists, and now charged on the civil list and consolidated fund, specifying with each name the sum received by each individual, the period of the



grant, the public ground or other consideration, as far as practicable, on account of which they have been granted, distinguishing those who are widows or orphans of deceased public servants, and such as are in the receipt of any salary, profits, pay, fees and emoluments from any public source." Such was the will of the house in May, 1833; had it been complied with? They were told it could not be complied with; and so he was inclined to think. The hon. member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Guest) had in an unreformed Parliament been enabled to obtain a return of the specific sum granted in one particular instance on the English pension list, and with the temerity, as some would call it, but honesty as he (Mr. Harvey) thought becoming a representative of the people, had pressed to be informed of the substantial public service which had been rendered by a lady of the name of Arbuthnot ("Hear," and laughter), who had so long received the sum of 900*l.* a year. There had been a return made to that, and what were the words which had been used? Why, that "it was granted to trustees to be paid to that lady during life, but to continue during our pleasure." (Hear, hear.) Now, there ought to have been as many returns, couched in the same terms, presented to the house as there were names on the pension list, commencing with "Whereas we are graciously pleased to grant to our right trusty and dearly beloved," &c., using, of course, a kindlier and softer phraseology as the delicateness of the person or the nature of the service performed might seem to require. (Much laughter.) It was quite clear that there must be another sort of inquiry, which was involved in the present motion. (Hear.) There must be a committee of real upright patriots, who should be empowered to call upon every one in the list to state the public grounds and considerations on which each grant had been made (hear, hear), and then one of two things, or both, would happen. All those who had any real grounds of valuable consideration to assign, would be eager to rescue themselves from the opprobrium they were now suffering: for the general feeling throughout the country was that all were alike bad, that there was no such thing as an honest grant, but that they were all, without distinction, the reward either of political servility or drawing-room compliance. ("Hear, hear," and much laughter.) So far from considering his present motion as at all an ungallant one, he was disposed to think it such as, were he ten years younger, would be most likely to secure for him all sorts of praise and gratitude from the loveliest of those whose names appeared in the pension list (laughter), because it would redeem the purest and the best from the worst and grossest imputations, that they were quietly luxuriating in lascivious indolence on the industry of the country. (Cheers, and cries of "Oh!") He was sure such imputations could not be thrown out without exciting the chivalrous nobility, who were all ready, no doubt to step forward in order to vindicate their proud and virtuous associates from the foul calumny (cheers) of being fastened on the industry of the country without valid and solid consideration. But while he believed that many persons would be rushing forward with all their trophies of honour, and all the emblems of their reward in their hands at once, not only silencing suspicion, but urging their undoubted meed of praise, there were others, he was sure, who would retire from the contest (hear, hear); and who, in answer to the circular issuing from the committee, calling on them to state the consideration of public service which they had given for the pension they had received, would no doubt present their grateful acknowledgments for having, through the supineness of the people and Parliament, been so long undisturbed as the recipients of the nation's bounty—some for half a century—and at last beg to resign all further pretensions to it. (Hear, hear.) This was a good suggestion for an economical government, which it became them to accept with the kindest feeling, by appointing the committee which he now had the honour to propose. (Hear, hear.) He most sincerely hoped the noble lord would not come forward and restrict the inquiry to those persons charged on the consolidated fund. Those in the civil list, he contended, were as open to the revision of Parliament as the others, the Crown standing only as trustee for the public. If otherwise, why was there any control at all? (Hear, hear.) Heaven forbid that anything which had fallen from him should have the effect of in any way agitating the seats or hearts of the present administration (hear); but having gone into the market-rooms of the country, and having par-

taken of the humble fare of the people—for now-a-days they were humble indeed—he did find that there was such a deep feeling among all classes—not the vulgar and unreading democracy, who would with desperate hands level every thing with a rude and destructive crash, but the middle, the enlightened, intelligent, thinking classes of society, that could no longer endure the present state of the pension list—he could not but bring the subject again before the house. But some four or five men who formed a cabinet then said, “Well, this is very unpleasant; we must listen to those charges, and therefore we will throw them (the names) on the consolidated fund, and God speed the result.” (Cries of “Hear,” and laughter.) Against that sort of amendment he protested. (Cheers.) But perhaps some noble lord would get up and say he should have wished the hon. and learned member (Mr. Harvey) had spared himself and the house the trouble of a long statement, government being prepared to accede to his motion; how he (Mr. Harvey) was anxious to put that to the test (cheers), and therefore, without troubling the house further at present, and reserving to himself the privilege of reply, he begged leave to propose that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the consideration of each grant in the pension list, and report the same to the house. (Cheers.)

Mr. HUME seconded the motion.

Lord ALTHORP rose to address the house. The noble lord stated, that before going into the general question which had been brought forward, he was anxious to disembarass it of some circumstances in which the memory of the hon. and learned member for Colchester had certainly failed him, with respect to the debates and resolutions which on former occasions had taken place. It had been stated that the amendment moved by the right hon. baronet, the member for Dundee (Sir H. Parnell), on the subject of the civil list was to refer the pension list to a select committee; but in reality it was to refer the whole of the civil list to a committee, and, as far as he recollected the debate, he did not think the pension list had been very particularly insisted on. (Hear, hear.) Again, the hon. and learned gentleman had said that he (Lord Althorp) declared this to be an open question. Now, he had admitted certainly on the occasion referred to, when proposing a grant of money for a particular period, and postponing for some time the bringing forward of the Civil List Act, that up to that time it was open (hear, hear); but he had never stated that it would be generally open, for after the Civil List Act was passed such an opinion would be directly contrary to the provisions of the act itself. (Hear, hear.) He had stated when the hon. and learned gentleman formerly introduced the subject, that it would be extremely difficult to vindicate all the grants in the pension list; but what was the real question which the house had now to decide? He apprehended the proposition of the hon. and learned gentleman amounted to this—that a committee be appointed to inquire into the pensions, with a view to decide whether they should continue, if it should appear that they had been improperly granted at the first. It was upon that ground that he felt perfectly ready to meet the hon. and learned gentleman’s proposition. The house must recollect that there was a great and most essential distinction between the questions whether a pension legally granted at the time had been properly so granted, and whether being improperly but legally granted it should be taken away? He did not hold the doctrine that the pensions on the civil list were completely without any control whatever, even though the prescribed limits were not exceeded, the Government for the time, as the responsible advisers of the Crown, being answerable to that house for the course they might recommend. But then the responsibility should be visited on the proper parties (hear), without taking away the benefit from those on whom a legal right had been conferred, because the advice which had originally been given might afterwards be considered to have been mistaken. (Hear, hear.) On the occasion to which the hon. and learned member had alluded he had argued, that as these pensions had always been considered as grants for the lives of those who held them, though you might have a legal right to take them away, you would commit an act of injustice if you did so. That was undoubtedly the case at the last discussion, but it was not so now. At present, whether you look to the justice or to the legality of these grants, you must admit that during the reign

of his present Majesty the parties in possession have a legal title to them. If you enter into a consideration of these grants, with a view of taking away the pensions from the present holders, you will take away from them a legal right. It might be, that the responsible ministers of the Crown, in advising these grants, acted wrongly in giving such advice—it might be that the original grants were quite indefensible, but the parties had received them according to law, and if you now proceeded to take them away, you would be depriving them of a right strictly legal. (“Hear,” and “Oh.”) He contended that it was right that the governing power should have means at its command for the reward of merit (hear, hear.)—for the relief of persons of station in distress (“No,” and “Hear”)—and for the remuneration of those who had distinguished themselves, not in the public service of the country, but in the scientific and literary attainments of civil life (Hear.) Honourable gentlemen would perhaps quote instances of pensions which did not come under any one of these categories. (Hear, and a laugh.) He did not mean to say that there were not some names on that list which ought not to have been there (loud cries of “Hear”); but when he said that, he must add that it was an abuse of power which had placed them there (hear), and that those who advised the abuse were and ought to be responsible for it. (Hear, hear.) The right to grant these pensions must exist somewhere under every government. There were names on the present list, and he had never denied, nor would he now deny the fact, which ought not to have been there. (Reiterated cheering.) But the strongest objection, as it appeared to him, against the list was, that it contained the names of several persons who were rightly placed upon it originally, but who since that time had acquired large incomes, which rendered them unfit objects for Royal benevolence. (Hear, and cries of “No.”) What! was not that change in their fortunes any objection to their continuance on the pension list? He thought that it was an objection, and a very strong objection indeed. (Hear, hear.) Though he was not prepared to take away any legal right from those now in the enjoyment of it, he would say this—that he should be sorry to be in the situation of such individuals, enjoying a large private income, and at the same time receiving a considerable pension from the Crown. (Hear, hear.) He had now stated the grounds on which he objected to the inquiry proposed in the present motion. He objected to it, because he thought that it was unjust to take away from any man that which was legally given to him.

The noble lord said he should not meet the motion with a direct negative, but propose certain resolutions by way of amendment: and these being read, at considerable length recapitulated the history of the alterations in the past and present reign—which, as matters of fact, no one would dispute; and then ended with the following rule or resolution for the regulation of the pension list in future:

“That it is the bounden duty of the responsible advisers of the Crown to recommend to his Majesty for grants of pensions on the Civil List, such persons only as have just claims on the Royal beneficence, or who by their personal services to the Crown, by the performance of duties to the public, or by their useful discoveries in science, and attainments in literature and the arts, have merited the gracious consideration of their Sovereign, and the gratitude of their country.”

Mr. Roebuck was desirous of the inquiry; and was of opinion that, if it appeared any pensions had been improperly applied, it followed, as a just and necessary consequence, that the advisers of the Crown should not only endure the punishment due to such misapplication, but that the pensions thus unjustly awarded should be withdrawn from those upon whom they had been conferred. If the argument used by the noble lord—that these pensions were guaranteed by Acts of Parliament—were admitted, there would be an end to discussion. It was not to be argued that an Act of Parliament could not be rescinded. If the law be bad, let the law be abolished. Night after night in that house new laws were made and old ones abrogated. The argument, therefore, drawn from the Acts of Parliament could not stand. The practice with regard to pensions should be brought back to the original position, the position which it ought to hold. As it at present obtained, it was highly pernicious. To be sure, the present holders of office were not responsible for the mal-appropriation of those who preceded them;

and though the persons then responsible may be now beyond the reach of the house, the errors and corruptions of their administration were not. Let those who deserved the royal bounty be pointed out; and let those also who enjoyed without deserving it be made known to the public. (Hear.) This country was more lavish in such expenditure than any other in Europe. It was an expenditure which must be lessened, but not to the detriment of the deserving. Where were those men of scientific and literary attainments to whom allusion had been made. It was well known that these grants were made, in most instances, for corrupt purposes, secret services, and God knows what. (Hear.) Let the objects of these pensions—as the motion of the member for Colchester required—be told distinctly out. If they be worthy, the possessors, instead of blushing, may take credit for them. The house must remember, if they rejected the motion, they refused one of the privileges of British subjects—the right of the public to inquire into the use or abuse of their money thus voted away. (Hear, hear, hear.) To be sure, much may be said about the items being trifling, but every small sum made up the aggregate. The principle, too, involved by the grant or the refusal of the inquiry was most important. The argument founded on the legality of the grants was a most unhappy one, and calculated even more than the ravings of the wildest anarchist to bring the law into contempt, and disrepute, by confounding under one and the same title, that which was discreditable with that which was meritorious. He regretted that the noble lord should sanction with the influence of his name, and the weight of his character, any thing tending to check inquiry on such a subject. The abuse of the pension list was a practice pregnant with the greatest mischief, and he would but trespass on their time solemnly to protest against any amendment which would impede the scrutiny proposed in the motion of the honourable member for Colchester.

Mr. D. W. HARVEY observed, in reply, that the long and interesting discussion in which they had been engaged had given rise, as might have been expected, to a variety of suggestions, some bearing fairly and fully upon the subject, some glancing lightly and partially upon it, and some not approaching it at all. ("Hear," and a laugh.) The hon. gentleman, the member for Cambridge, indeed, had reduced his opposition to the motion to a shape perfectly simple and intelligible. He (Mr. Rice) told them fairly that whatever objections they might have entertained against this list from prejudice, or whatever errors or offences they might have detected in it by inquiry, yet were their lips closed by acts of their own. The hon. secretary appealed to two acts of Parliament as an stopper to all effort upon their part, and declared to them that however baseless and disgusting any or all of these pensions might be, however degrading to the characters of those who might receive, and however insulting to the feelings of those who were compelled to pay them, yet that because that list had received the sanction of an unreformed Parliament, it was conclusive, notwithstanding that they, the representatives of a reformed constituency, were sent to that house mainly to correct evils of this description. (Hear, hear.) He denied that the house stood in this position. (Hear, hear.) He reminded them that these acts had been passed at a period when the friends of the people in that house were unwilling to bestrew the path or the Ministry with difficulties in addition to the many against which they had already to contend. He should feel inclined to deny the position, even if the acts had been passed after the gravest deliberation—if they had received the solemn sanction of a Parliament composed of men deeply imbued with the feelings of the people. But as it was, he could not conceive that any obligation rested upon a Parliament pledged to economy,—pledged to inquiry into every payment not justified by necessity and sanctioned by individual merit. (Cheers.) He begged to ask the hon. gentleman if those pensioners stood on a better point of view now than they did in the reign of George IV.? Were they more deserving—more renowned—more pure—more virtuous? ("Hear" and laughter.) No! All that Government could claim for them was, that they were no worse. ("Hear," and laughter.) Had not the house then the same right to deal with them now that it had when the Government was at that side, when the noble lord and his friends were in opposition? (Hear, hear.) But when the hon. member behind him moved in 1838 for an inquiry into this

list, how was it put by the right hon. baronet (Sir R. Peel) who had that night so consistently supported his own doctrines as put forward by his old opponents from the ministerial benches? The right hon. baronet spoke of these pensions as a sacred fund, accessible only to the royal hand, to be distributed by the royal will, and in such sort as the royal feeling might direct. Oh! it was to be sacred from the vulgar scrutiny of the public, and the meddling interference of Parliament! (Hear, hear.) But what said the noble lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer? (Cheers.) He said that the hon. member for Middlesex did not desire to bring the house into unnecessary conflict with the Crown, but simply to know if certain sums of money were not improvidently disposed of. (Hear, hear.) And then the noble lord proceeded to say,—in that plain unadorned downright style for which he is remarkable, and which is far more forcible upon occasion than the most exquisite eloquence (“hear,” and laughter,)—if there was nothing discreditable in the expenditure, wherefore was it that government resisted the inquiry? (Loud cheers.) The noble lord convinced him. (Hear, hear,” and laughter.) He voted with the noble lord (hear, hear), and were they now to conclude that the conduct of the noble lord upon that memorable occasion was only a passage in the tactics of opposition? (Cheers.) Were the doctrines which the noble lord had advocated when out of place to be flung aside, like infected garments, the moment he made the haven of power? (Cheers.) If not, why was it that he now seemed to regard it as his duty to cherish and defend that pension list, of which he had strenuously demanded an investigation? (Cheers.)

The hon. Secretary for the Treasury had certainly displayed a most laudable zeal in the same good cause. Now it was true he was not the representative of the corporation, but if not now he would be so hereafter. The corporation would see that they had altogether mistaken him; a member of a Government half-Whig, half-Radical, he was naturally regarded with apprehension and distrust. He was looked upon most probably as an ally of those travelling commissioners, who went about the country seeking whom they might devour (laughter); hunting out every vein of corporation corruption, that they might drag him into light and expose him to the public contempt! (Hear, hear.) But now, after the hon. gentleman's vigorous defence of vested rights, the corporation of Cambridge would at once perceive their error, and joyfully exclaim, “This is the very man for us!” (Laughter.) “This is just what we wanted—a representative who will see in every alderman a peer, and in every common-councilman a member of Parliament.” (Hear, and laughter.) The hon. member next proceeded to disclaim all ungenerous or unkindly feeling towards persons on the pension list. If there were any on that list either so extremely young or so stricken in age that their helpless condition might render them objects of solicitude to the great, he was satisfied to permit them to be excepted from the proposed inquiry. (Laughter.) And with respect to cases of another kind, he was quite sure that if there could be raised in favour of their exception, from investigation, any thing which if modesty might conceal, generosity would yet suggest, the committee would receive it cheerfully. (Hear, hear.) He remembered that the present Earl Grey, when a member of that house, opposed a motion brought forward by Mr. Huskisson, touching the amount of pensions paid to retired Chancellors, and the time of their services. The motion was made with the view of attacking the pension of Mr. Ponsonby, who had only held office for some six months under the Whigs. But upon this question Lord Howick observed that Mr. Huskisson was not the best man in the world to resist improper grants of the public money, when so many had been made to himself and his connexions. Now, if he (Mr. Harvey) were to describe the pensions of the most obnoxious persons upon the list, he would not desire to employ other words than those addressed by the present Earl Grey to Mr. Huskisson upon that occasion, for he proceeded to say, “Got by what means the Lord only knew, and for what the Devil only knew.” (Cheers and laughter.) If he (Mr. Harvey) were to apply such language to the pension of any body, it would be declared a piece of gross vulgarity and low abuse. (Hear, hear.) But yet Lord Grey was not ashamed of the expressions. Why, they embodied the sound Whig doctrines upon the subject

(cheers); and when Lord Howick, in the excess of his virtuous indignation against undeserved pensions to the connexions of an individual in power, used these words to one who was present—to a man, and one so capable of defending himself, like Mr. Huskisson,—what would he not have said if he had to deal with the persons now upon the list, who were less capable of defending themselves, and who were, moreover, absent? The noble lord opposite refused them inquiry, but he promised them amendment. It was easy to give promises; a stock of promises was one that never failed, it possessed the power of internal renovation. (Laughter.) He appealed to hon. members to remember the pledges they had given to their constituents, and he called upon the house, without inflicting injury upon the existing race of pensioners, to take care that the list should be more pure hereafter. If there was amongst us aught of military glory, of glory on the sea, of literary renown, or of philosophy in retirement, for examples of these we should be enabled to turn an eye of pride upon our pension list. In conclusion, he anxiously demanded an inquiry, and besought the house not to insult the sorrows of the people, or excite their indignation.

Mr. Harvey's reply was considered so powerful and triumphant, that he sat down amidst the loudest cheers; and when the gallery was cleared for a division, and the question put from the chair, it appeared to be the general feeling of the House that the numbers for and against would be very nearly equal; an apprehension as visible in the sad and fallen countenances of those who occupied the Ministerial benches, as in the exhilarating looks of those who were the supporters of the motion. At the commencement of the debate, it was thought that the Minority would be about 100, and the Majority 200. As the weakness of the Ministerial defence became apparent in the progress of the discussion, the calculations rose to a more even balance; and on the numbers being announced after the Division was over, the result was regarded, as it in reality must be considered, as a complete triumph for the Liberal party; and as such it was hailed with loud and long-continued cheers. With great pains, an accurate list of the Minority who went out was prepared after the House adjourned; that is from one to two o'clock in the morning; and it is given in our present Number. The list of the Majority, who remained in, was not to be so easily completed; but we hope to be able to present it in our next Number, that the country may see who are the supporters of Ministers on this more than questionable occasion.

#### POWER OF INFLECTING PAIN.

PLEASURE appears to be a feeble instrument of obedience in comparison with pain. It is much more easy to despise pleasure than pain. Above all, it is important to consider, that in this class of instruments is included the power of taking away life, and with it of taking away not only all the pleasures of reality, but what goes far beyond them, all the pleasures of hope. This class of securities is, therefore, incomparably the strongest. He who desires obedience, to a high degree of exactness, cannot be satisfied with the power of giving pleasure, he must have the power of inflicting pain. He who desires it, to the highest possible degree of exactness, must desire power of inflicting pain sufficient at least to insure that degree of exactness—that is, an unlimited power of inflicting pain; for as there is no possible mark by which to distinguish what is sufficient and what is not, and as the human mind sets no bounds to its avidity for the securities of what it deems eminently good, it is sure to extend, beyond almost any limits, its desire of the power of giving pain to others.—*Mill.*

## NEW EDITION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY POCKET COMPANION FOR 1834.

THE readers of the PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW will remember, that on the very first appearance of this work, at the opening of the first session of the Reformed Parliament for 1833, we spoke of it in terms of that high commendation which we really felt it to deserve. It was even then surprisingly complete: but we must now admit that the second edition, which has just issued from the press, is more copious, more varied, and more accurate than the first. It now contains, we think, within the compass of what may literally be called a *pocket book*—all the information important to be known of nearly all the members of both Houses of Parliament, so as to enable Electors and readers of newspapers to ascertain from its pages the public character of almost every public man. Its fairness and impartiality are quite as striking as its accuracy, and in every point of view it is entitled to the most extensive support. Of the improvements introduced into the second edition, the Editors give the following statement, which, we believe, will be found perfectly correct:

“Amongst the first of these which will strike the reader is a new arrangement of the peerage portion, by which facility of reference will be much increased. The additions to this division consist chiefly in further information respecting the political sentiments of each peer, and the amount of church patronage he may happen to possess. On the novelty and value of this branch of information with regard to Lords and Commons, it is needless to insist, and the utmost pains have been taken to render it authentic. There have been likewise added the second titles, the orders of knighthood, several additional offices, and anecdotes, with the origin of many of the peerages: thus presenting a complete view of the House of Lords, marked by two striking characteristics in which all other peerages, from the nature of their plans, are necessarily deficient, namely, the political principles and church patronage of each peer.

“With respect to the House of Commons the interval of the vacation has afforded an opportunity of introducing much new matter, which the kindness of members of both houses supplied, and which extraordinary success has stimulated the Compilers to seek from numerous public records, and a variety of other sources; so that this department of the work may be considered all but perfect. Amongst its new features will be found the church patronage of each member of the lower house. Several improvements have likewise been made in the list of the places returning members; the account of which constitutes a complete body of the statistics of representation, detailing all the valuable facts connected with these subjects that lie scattered through a vast mass, as well of parliamentary papers as of other documents not less authentic.

### UNIVERSAL DESIRE OF POWER.

THAT one human being will desire to render the person and property of another subservient to his pleasures, notwithstanding the pain or loss of pleasure which it may occasion to that other individual, is the foundation of Government. The desire of the object implies the desire of the power necessary to accomplish the object. The desire, therefore, of that power which is necessary to render the persons and properties of human beings subservient to our pleasures, is a grand governing law of human nature.—*Mill*.

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR.

### HARDSHIP AND INJUSTICE IMPOSED ON CHURCHMEN AT CHELTENHAM.

SIR,

Cheltenham, Feb. 5, 1834.

A VERY general idea seems to be prevalent throughout the country, that the Administration are about to bring forward a Church Reform Bill. May I beg leave, therefore, through the medium of your highly talented publication, to submit to public consideration the following case :

The town of Cheltenham, from an insignificant village of 1500 to 2000 inhabitants, has increased to a place of 30,000, during which time the parish church remains in its original contracted state, and is only aided by one Free Church, which is of recent construction.

In consequence of the Parish Church being incapable of affording sufficient accommodation to such an enlarged population, *and before the existence of the Free Church*, three new ones had arisen, erected at the expense of individuals, or of joint stock companies. To these, persons in communion with the Church of England, are compelled to resort, for want of the Parish Church affording accommodation, and that at a very heavy expense; part of which is appropriated to the payment of their own minister, organist, pew openers, &c. &c.

Now, in such cases, it appears a great hardship to those compelled to resort to such churches, to be called upon to pay rates towards a church where they are not allowed a sitting.

Had the successive incumbents of the parish, during their respective ministry, as they found their accommodation in the church stationary, while the population was increasing, applied to Government and the Church Building Society, for funds in aid of their enlarging the Parish Church, or erecting sufficient Chapels of Ease, then there could not have been a reasonable cause of complaint. If, as is supposed, the Dissenters are henceforward to be exempted by the Church Reform Bill, from payment of rates towards a Church in whose services or ceremonies they will not participate, will it not be a hard case to continue such an impost upon a body, whose most just claim for exemption *should be* that they remain firm in the faith of our National Church, though compelled to seek religious instruction without its walls, at an extra expense?

The exemption of Dissenters from such payment, whilst there is a continuance of it towards Churchmen, situated as those I have described, will have a tendency to reward Dissent, and will be a most manifest injustice to such as I have named, in the minds of all unprejudiced persons.

### NARRATIVE—ILLUSTRATIVE OF IMPRESSMENT.

JAMES INGHAM was born in Leeds, in the year 1752, in the reign of king George the Second, and when about three years of age, or little more, his father, John Ingham, was impressed, and sent on board a man of war; he served in an engagement with Lord Hawke against the French, in which engagement he lost his life, and his family never saw him more. One of his sons, James, was put out apprentice by the parish of Leeds at the early age of seven; but when about



seventeen, he went to Liverpool, and engaged on board a ship bound for the coast of Guinea. After a long absence he returned home, married, and had twelve children, of whom four sons served in the army and navy, two of them have been impressed, and one of them twice. His brother John, as well as his father, had been impressed also. The punishment of flogging on board a man of war is, he asserts, far more severe and shocking, than that inflicted on the slaves in the plantations. The James Ingham here spoken of, is now in the eighty-second year of his age, and living at Sheffield. He has had his father impressed, his brother and two sons impressed, and two other sons in the army, and yet he is not considered entitled to, nor does he receive, any pension or support in his old age.

### PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS—SESSION OF 1834.

ANALYSIS of the Petitions for the Abolition of Slavery in 1833, showing the number received from the various Religious Denominations, and the amount of Signatures, compared with the number of other Petitions on the same subject.

Denominations.	Petitions.	Signatures.
Baptists	188	26,287
— General	13	1,340
— Particular	49	6,742
Calvinistic Methodists	9	1,431
Calvinistic Nonconformists	1	100
Catholics	5	333
Countess of Huntingdon's Chapels	4	507
Independents, or Congregationalists	205	26,080
New Connexion Methodists	27	3,965
New Connexion General Baptists	1	80
Old Independents, or Inghamites	3	350
Pædobaptists	1	208
Presbyterians	11	2,527
Primitive Methodists	13	1,770
Protestant Dissenters	235	26,776
Protestant Evangelical Dissenters *	1	84
Relief Church	3	1,016
Society of Friends, or Quakers	15	933
Unitarians	4	425
United Associate Seceders	84	21,905
United Christians	1	119
Wesleyan Methodists	1,953	229,426
	2,826	352,404
Other Petitions	2,194	957,527
Total	5,020	1,309,931

\* There are also two Petitions from Protestant Evangelical Dissenters in Kelso; one is classed with the United Associate Seceders, the other with the Relief Church: to which denominations the Petitioners state themselves otherwise to belong.

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

### LIST OF THE MAJORITY OF 169.

Tellers included, who voted for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the conduct of Mr. Baron Smith, in respect of his neglect of duty as a Judge, and the introduction of political topics in his charges to grand juries.

#### ENGLAND.

Agliouby, H. A.	Ellis, W.	Littleton, E. J.	Scholefield, J.
Althorp, Lord	Ewart, W.	Locke, W.	Scrope, P.
Attwood, T.	Fenton, J.	Mangles, J.	Seale, Colonel
Bambridge, E. T.	Fergusson, Sir R.	Marshall, J.	Shawe, R. N.
Barnett, C. J.	Feilden, J.	Marsland, T.	Sheppard, T.
Beaumont, T. W.	Fort J.	Milton, Viscount	Simeon, Sir R. G.
Bewes, T.	Godson, R.	Molseworth, Sir W.	Skipwith, Sir G.
Bish, T.	Gordon, R.	Molyneux, Lord	Smith, R. V.
Blake, Sir F.	Grant, R.	Mosley, Sir O.	Stanley, E. G. S.
Blackburne, J.	Grey, Hon. Col.	Ord, W. H.	Stanley, Hon. H. T.
Blunt, C.	Grey, Sir G.	Paget, F.	Strutt, E.
Bower, J.	Gronow, Capt.	Palmer, General	Tancred, H. W.
Briggs, R.	Grote, G.	Parlmerston, Visc.	Tayleur, W.
Brocklehurst, J.	Guest, J.	Parker, J.	Thicknesse, M.
* Brodie, W. B.	Gully, J.	Parrott, J.	Todd, N.
Brotherton, J.	Hall, B.	Pease, J.	Tracy, C. M.
Burdett, Sir F.	Handley, B.	Pendarves, E. W.	Troubridge, Sir T.
Campbell, Sir J.	Handley, —	Penleaze, J. J.	Tynte, C. J. K.
Cayley, E. S.	Harvey, D. W.	Phillpotts, J.	Vivian, J. H.
Chaytor, Sir W.	Heathcote, J.	Ponsonby, Hon. W.	Walker, R.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Hill, M. D.	Potter, R.	Warburton, H.
Childers, J. W.	Hodges, T. L.	Poulter, J.	Walter, J.
Clay, W.	Hutt, W.	Pryme, G.	Ward, H. G.
Collier, J.	Jervis, J.	Richards, R.	Wason, R.
* Crawford, W.	Kennedy, J.	Rider, T.	Whalley, Sir S.
Davenport, J.	Lambton, H.	Rolfe, R. M.	Williams, Colonel
Dawson, E.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Romilly, J.	Wood, C.
Dilwyn, L. W.	Lefevre, C. S.	Romilly, E.	Wood, Alderman
Divett, E.	Lennox, Lord G.	Rumbold, C. E.	
Donkin, Sir R.	Lester, B. L.	Russell, Lord J.	
Dundas, Sir R.	Lister, E.	Scott, Sir E. D.	

#### SCOTLAND.

Adams, A.	Loch, J.	Oliphant, L.	Pringle, R.
Elliot, Hon. Captain	Mackeod, R.	Oswald, J.	Stewart, R.
Hay, Colonel L.	Maxwell, J.	Oswald, R.	Wallace, R.
Jeffrey, F.	Murray, J. A.		

#### IRELAND.

Barron, W.	* Fitzsimon, N.	O'Connor, Don	Vigors, N. A.
Bellew, H.	French, F.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Walker, C. A.
Blake, M.	Grattan, H.	Roe, J.	Wallace, T.
Butler, Hon. Col.	Lynch, A. H.	Ruthven, E. S.	
Chapman, M. L.	Nagle, Sir R.	Ruthven, E.	
Finn, W. F.	* O'Connell, J.	Sheil, R. L.	
Fitzgerald, T.	O'Connell, M.	Sullivan, R.	
Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connor, F.	Talbot, J. H.	

#### TELLERS.

Hume, J.  
O'Connell, D.

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 72.

On Mr. O'Connell's Motion for a Committee to Inquire into the Judicial Conduct of  
Baron Smith.

Agnew, Sir A.	Fleetwood, P. H.	Johnstone, Sir J.	Spankie, Serjeant
Arbuthnot, General	Forster, C. S.	King, B.	Tullamore, Lord
Baillie, H.	Graham, Sir J.	Lopes, Sir R.	Tyrell, Sir J.
Bankers, W.	Grimston, Lord	Lygon, Colonel	Verner, Lieut.-Col.
Baring, A.	Halkomb, J.	Moreton, A. H.	Villiers, Lord
Baring, H.	Harford, H.	Peel, Sir E.	Vivyan, Sir R.
Barnard, E. J.	Hammer, Sir J.	Pigot, R.	Wall, B.
Bentink, Lord G.	Hardinge, Sir H.	Plumtree, J. P.	Welby, W. E.
Blackstone, W. S.	Hardy, J.	Reid, Sir J.	Williams, W.
Browne, D.	Hay, Sir J.	Rice, S.	Willoughby, Sir H.
Bruce, Lord E.	Hayes, Sir E.	Rickford, A.	Wood, Colonel
Chapman, A.	Henniker, Lord	Robinson, G. R.	Yorke, Captain
Cripps, W.	Hope, H. T.	Ridley, Sir M. W.	Young, G. F.
Christmas, W.	Hotham, Lord	Ryle, J.	Young, J.
Curteis, H. B.	Hughes, H.	Sandon, Lord	
Dalmeny, Lord	Ingham, M.	Scarlett, Sir J.	TELLERS.
Dykes, F. L. B.	Iton, S.	Sharpe, General	Shaw, F.
Evans, G.	Jones, Captain	Sinclair, G.	Inglis, Sir R.
Ewing, M.	Johnston, A.		

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 21.

Tellers included, who voted for Mr. Hume's motion to reduce the Navy Estimates  
from 27,500 men to 25,000, including 6,500 marines, and 1,000 boys.

Blake, M.	Fitzsimon, C.	Parnell, Sir H.	Wallace, R.
Buller, C.	Gaskell, D.	Ruthven, E.	Williams, Colonel
Brotherton, J.	Jervis, J.	Romilly, J.	
Cobbett, W.	Lister, E.	Vigors, J. N.	TELLER.
Felden, J.	Oswald, R.	Wason, R.	Hume, J.
Faithfull, G.	O'Connor, F.	Warburton, H.	

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 30.

Teller included, who voted to reduce the salary of the First Lord of the Admiralty  
from 4,500*l.* to 4,000*l.* a-year.

Attwood, T.	Fitzsimon, N.	Lister, E.	Ruthven, E.
Blake, M.	Fitzsimon, C.	Nagle, Sir R.	Vigors, J. N.
Butler, Colonel	Fitzgerald, T.	O'Connell, D.	Talbot, J. H.
Brotherton, J.	Finn, W.	O'Connell, M.	Wallace, R.
Beaucherk, Major	Gaskell, D.	O'Connell, J.	Walker, C. A.
Cobbett, W.	Hume, J.	O'Connor, F.	
Faithfull, G.	Hutt, W.	Oswald, R.	TELLER.
Felden, John	Jervis, J.	Parrott, J.	Ruthven, E.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

*In the List of Members, with their party designations, as published in our First Number, some omissions and errors escaped notice, notwithstanding the great pains bestowed on its compilation. It is too late for revision. We hope to take an early opportunity, however, of correcting these errors, and making the List as complete as possible.*

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 184,

Tellers included, who voted for Mr. D. W. Harvey's Motion, that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the consideration of each Grant in the Pension List, and report the same to the House.

## ENGLAND.

Aglionby, H. A.	Faithfull, G.	Lennox, Lord W.	Sheppard, T.
Attwood, T.	Fancourt, Major	Lennox, Lord G.	Simeon, Sir R. G.
Baillie, J. E.	Fenton, J.	Lennox, Lord A.	Spry, S. T.
Bainbridge, E. T.	Feilden, W.	Lester, B. L.	Stanley, E. J.
Barnard, E. J.	Fielden, J.	Lester, E.	Staveley, J. K.
Beauclerk, Major	Fleetwood, P. H.	Lloyd, J. H.	Strickland, Sir G.
Benett, J.	Fort, J.	Locke, W.	Strutt, E.
Bewes, T.	Fryer, R.	Marshall, J.	Talmash, A. G.
Bish, T.	Gaskell, D.	Martin, J.	Tancred, H. W.
Blackburn, J.	Godson, R.	Methuen, P.	Taylor, W.
Blake, Sir F.	Goreing, H. D.	Molesworth, Sir W.	Tennyson, C.
Blunt, Sir C. B.	Grote, G.	Moreton, Hon. H. G.	Thicknesse, R.
Boss, J. G.	Guest, J. J.	Palmer, General	Todd, R.
Bowes, J.	Gully, J.	Palmer, C. F.	Tooke, W.
Briggs, R.	Hall, B.	Parker, J.	Torrens, Col.
Briscoe, J.	Handley, B.	Parrott, J.	Townshend, Lord C.
Brocklehurst, J.	Handley, H.	Pease, J.	Trelawney, W. L. S.
Brotherton, J.	Hardy, J.	Petre, Hon. E.	Turner, W.
Buckingham, J. S.	Hawes, B.	Phillips, M.	Vincent, Sir F.
Buller, C.	Heathcote, J. J.	Plumtree, J. P.	Walter, J.
Cayley, E. S.	Hill, M. D.	Potter, R.	Warburton, H.
Chaytor, Sir W.	Hodges, T. L.	Ramsbottom, J.	Wason, R.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Hughes, H.	Richards, J.	Watkins, I. L.
Clay, W.	Hudson, T.	Rickford, W.	Watson, Hon. R.
Codrington, Sir E.	Humphrey, J.	Rider, T.	Whalley, Sir S.
Coller, J.	Hurst, R. H.	Rippon, C.	Whitmore, W. W.
Crompton, J.	Hutt, W.	Robinson, G. R.	Wigney, J. R.
Curtis, H. B.	Ingham, R.	Roebuck, J. A.	Wilbraham, G.
Curtis, Captain	Jervis, J.	Romilly, E.	Wilks, J.
Davies, Colonel	Kemp, T. R.	Sandford, E. A.	Williams, W. C.
Dawson, E.	Kennedy, J.	Scholefield, J.	Williams, Col.
Diffeyn, L. W.	King, E. B.	Scott, J. W.	Windham, W. H.
Divett, E.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Scrope, C. P.	Winnington, H.
Dykes, F. L.	Langton, Col. G.	Seale, Colonel	Wood, Ald.
Evans, Colonel	Lecch, J.	Shaw, R. N.	Young, C. P.
Ewart, W.	Lefevre, C. S.		

## SCOTLAND.

Dunlop, Capt.	Johnston, A.	Oswald, R. A.	Sharpe, Gen.
Ewing, J.	Oliphaunt, L.	Oswald, J.	Sinclair, G.
Gillon, W. D.	Ormelie, Earl of	Pringle, R.	Wallace, R.

## IRELAND.

Barron, W.	Fitzgerald, T.	O'Connell, M.	Ruthven, T. J.
Bellew, R. M.	Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connell, J.	Ruthven, E. S.
Blake, M.	Grattan, H.	O'Connor, Don	Sheil, R. L.
Butler, Hon. Col.	Lambert, H.	O'Connor, F.	Sullivan, R.
Crisp, M. L.	Lynch, A. H.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Talbot, J. H.
Evans, G.	Macnamara, F.	Roche, D.	Vigors, N. A.
Finn, W. F.	O'Connell, D.	Roe, Jas.	Walker, C. A.

## PAIRED OFF IN FAVOUR.

Tynte, C. J. K. Romilly, J. Morrison, J.

## TALLERS.

Harvey, D. W. Hume, J.

*Account of the Net Public Income of Great Britain and Ireland.*

In the Year ended 5th January, 1834, after abating the EXPENDITURE thereout defrayed by the several Revenue Departments, and of the Actual Issues or Payments within the same Period; exclusive of the Sums applied to the Redemption of Funded, or paying off Unfunded Debt, and of the Advances and Repayments for Local Works.

INCOME OR REVENUE.	Applicable to the Consolidated Fund.			Applicable to the Public Service.			TOTAL.		
<i>Ordinary Revs. &amp; Recpts.</i>	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
CUSTOMS . . . . .	12,798,917	13	1½	3,410,022	15	4½	16,208,940	8	6½
EXCISE . . . . .	16,543,711	14	4½	-	-	-	16,543,711	14	4½
STAMPS . . . . .	6,928,309	16	11	-	-	-	6,928,309	16	11
TAXES . . . . .	4,892,058	9	7½	-	-	-	4,892,058	9	7½
POST-OFFICE . . . . .	1,513,800	-	-	-	-	-	1,513,800	-	-
1s. 6d. & 4s. on Penions and salaries	28,998	12	-	-	-	-	28,998	12	-
Small Branches of King's Hereditary Revenues	25,567	18	4	-	-	-	25,567	18	4
Surplus Fees of Regulated Public Offices	26,183	8	2	-	-	-	26,183	8	2
Poundage Fees, Pells Fees, &c., in Ireland	3,029	16	-½	-	-	-	3,029	16	-½
£.	42,760,577	8	7	3,410,022	15	4½	46,170,600	3	11½
<i>Other Receipts.</i>									
Imprests & other Monies	15,588	11	10½	21	18	2	15,610	10	-½
Monies received from the East India Com.	-	-	-	60,000	-	-	60,000	-	-
Money recvd. from Bk. of Eng. on account of Unclmd. Dividends	-	-	-	25,115	14	8	25,115	14	8
£.	42,776,166	-	5½	3,495,160	8	2½	46,271,326	8	7½

EXPENDITURE.

<i>Funded Debt.</i>				£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
INTEREST and Management of the Per- manent Debt	}	24,270,049	16	8½					
Terminable Annuities		3,472,688	14	7½					
Total Charge of the Funded Debt, ex- clusive of £5,977. 4s. 3d.; the Interest on Donations & Bequests	}	27,472,738	11	4½					
<i>Unfunded Debt.</i>									
Interest on Exchequer Bills		779,769	1	6			28,522,507	12	10½
Civil List		510,000	-	-					
Pensions		509,163	17	10½					
Salaries and Allowances		132,068	7	-					
Diplomatic Salaries and Pensions		211,696	11	11					
Courts of Justice		377,966	6	9					
Miscellaneous Charges on the Con. Fund		205,086	13	11					
Mint Establishment		14,534	10	-					
Bounties granted for the Encouragement of Hemp and Flax in Scotland, per Act 27 Geo. III. c. 13, s. 65	}	2,956	13	8			1,963,473	1	1½
							30,485,980	7½	-¼
Army		6,590,061	18	8½					
Navy		4,360,235	6	3					
Ordnance		1,314,806	-	-					
Miscellaneous; chargeable upon the An- nual Grants of Parliament	}	2,007,158	18	1½			14,272,262	3	1
					£.		44,758,242	17	1½
							1,513,083	11	6½
SURPLUS OF INCOME OVER EXPENDITURE									

SURPLUS OF INCOME OVER EXPENDITURE . . . . .  
 Whitehall, Treasury Chambers, } T. SPRING RICE.  
 14 February, 1834. } £. 46,271,325 8 7½

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1834.

REFORM OF THE LAW.—IMPROVEMENTS IN THE  
PRACTICE OF PLEADING.

THIS is indeed the age of Reform. Even Law itself, which we remember to have heard proclaimed from the Bench as “the perfection of reason”—a reason which it was a sort of petty treason to gainsay—is now, like everything human, undergoing that change and adaptation to times and circumstances, which must render it more perfect and more fitting for the state of society in which we live. What changes have taken place within the last fifteen years! We remember well the time when the humane attempts of Sir Samuel Romilly to mitigate the Draco-like severity of the Criminal code were denounced by the Bench and the great majority of the Bar; and when a judge at the Old Bailey, speaking of this enlightened Reformer, who was greatly in advance of his age, did not hesitate to say, “How very ignorant of law and criminal practice our would-be Improver is.” And yet, in twelve years from that time, we have seen a Home Secretary sanctioning by his approval, many of the benevolent ideas of Romilly, while the utterer of the judicial sneer sleeps with his fathers, and is as entirely forgotten as though he never had existed.

It was the proud boast of Lord Grey, in the Debate on the Reform Bill, that his view was not to destroy but to restore. “Boroughmongering,” said the eloquent Premier, “is no part of the Constitution of Great Britain; and the Reform Bill, in sweeping away Rotten Boroughs, goes but to restore the ancient practice of the Constitution.” The Reformers of the science of pleading may make as proud, because as true a boast; for the object of the late Rules and Regulations just laid on the table of the House of Commons for its approval, is not to destroy, but to amend and restore the ancient simplicity of our Common Law in this one of its most important branches. It will be remembered by those of our readers who followed our Summary of the Parliamentary Papers, that on the 14th of August, in the past year, an Act was passed for the amendment of the Law, and the better advancement of Justice. This Act imposed on the Judges a new description of public duty, viz.: to frame Rules relating to Pleading, and the entering and transcribing Pleadings, Judgments, and other proceedings in Actions at Law, and respecting Costs and otherwise, Stat. 3 and 4, W. IV., c. 42. These rules are not to become abso-

lately obligatory until they shall have been laid before both Houses of Parliament, for six weeks.

In pursuance of the Act, the Rules have been already prepared, and they are now on the table of the House, open to the inspection of all the Members. They are the result of the united deliberations of the Common Law Commission (which has been labouring for five years on this subject), and of all the Judges. We do not therefore, contemplate, nor is it indeed reasonably to be expected, that any material alteration will be made in these Rules in the Lower House; at least before their practical operation has been for some time experienced.

The Rules involve, not merely technical questions, but most extensively affect the due administration of Justice. Hence they are of very great national importance. Their object is not to introduce innovations so much as to prevent abuses. Every reader of the Law Reports, even in Newspapers, must have with pain observed how often a cause, which appeared to him to be just, has been defeated on some technical informality, or variance, in what are called the Pleadings—that is, the written statement of the complaint, and the answer thereto on which issue is joined. How often must he have even perceived that calling a man Thomas William Johnson, instead of William Thomas Johnson, has operated injuriously to a plaintiff. For the future, however, this crying injustice will be remedied. Powers have been given to Judges to amend the misstatements of facts, in the pleadings of either party, at any time pending a trial, upon just terms. The three principal improvements consequent on the Rules will be: First, to confine the statement of the plaintiff's cause of action to one count, when heretofore there might have been seven, eight, or ten, to the great cost of the suitor, to the manifest intricacy and confusion of the whole proceedings, but certainly to the very great gain of Attorneys, Pleaders, and Counsel. Secondly, a compelling of the plaintiff, by penalty, not to retain more than one count. Thirdly, a restraining the use of what is called the Plea of General Issue, and a compelling of a Defendant to state in his Plea the precise point on which he intends to rely at the trial, instead of obliging the plaintiff to prove every allegation, or even, as at present, to take him by surprise, by some unknown or unexpected ground of defence.

These, it will be admitted, are improvements demanded by the plainest sense of the most ignorant of mankind. Explicitness in the stating of the grounds of action and defence; brevity in the curtailment of prolix, tedious, and often nonsensical repetitions. Compression in narrowing the issue, and limiting the number of points to be tried, and thereby not only diminishing expense, but also the risk of failure in proof of comparatively immaterial allegations. Economy in the reduction of the expenses now incident to the subpoenaing, conveying, and maintaining of witnesses to, from, and at the place of trial, all matters of main importance to suitors and the public, and we hail, as auspicious, any attempts to accomplish these objects.

In the earlier ages of English history, Law proceedings were much simpler and less expensive than at present. No doubt as population and commerce, and their almost inseparable adjunct, litigation, increased, new intricacies disclosed themselves; but we think, that although some of these were inseparable from the subject, still that by far the greater number had their origin in the craft and cupidity of

professional lawyers. No man of common sense can say that the small, we may say indeed, the infinitely little variations which for some time have obtained in the framing of multifarious counts in the same declaration, so as to meet the various preconceived shades of a case, are not repugnant to common sense. As the elder Mr. Chitty well remarks: "If a pleader were requested to draw a declaration for a breach of promise of marriage, he would, without stopping to inquire into all the circumstances, introduce four or five counts; as—First, on a supposed promise to marry on a particular day, leaving the attorney to insert the actual day, or some day about the time.—Secondly, a promise to marry on request;—Thirdly, a promise to marry within a reasonable time;—Fourthly, a promise to marry generally, and showing as a breach, a request, and non-performance;—and Fifthly, a count in a general promise to marry, and stating, as a breach, the dispensation of any request by defendant's marriage with another person." Now who can doubt that the introduction of these numerous special counts, in a simple case such as this, arises from what Mr. Chitty calls the "sordid cupidity of some practitioners to increase their emoluments by lengthy pleadings, and sometimes even by the more culpable desire of vexatiously punishing a defendant by an accumulation of unnecessary costs."

On this latter point, till recently, there could be no shadow of doubt; for by a very recent, but now exploded rule of practice, the plaintiff recovered the cost of all the numerous counts in a declaration, although he had succeeded only in one. It was, therefore, no marvel that the attorney and pleader spun out over a half score of counts the matter of complaint which might have been disclosed in one. These numerous counts are comparatively of modern date. Lord Holt, one of the ablest lawyers that ever sat on the bench, in regretting their adoption, alludes to their origin, and says that he was a bold man who first ventured to introduce them, because they contracted the principles and objects of pleading. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the practice of pleading several pleas established itself more and more. By the 4th Anne, c. 16., it was enacted that it should be lawful for any defendant or any plaintiff in replevin in any court of record, with the leave of the court, to plead as many several matters as he should think necessary for his defence. Hence a practice crept in of allowing the defendant, instead of pleading several pleas, separately denying all the parts of the declaration, to plead the general issue; which was so vague and wide as to admit, under cover of its ambuscade, almost any sort or ground of defence. These inconveniencies, which according to Lord Holt, crept in improperly, will be found prohibited by the fifth Rule laid on the table of the House of Commons. This Rule very justly limits the declaration to one count in describing the same cause of action, liberally allowing amendments according to the spirit of the enactment.

The effect of this Rule will be to require more care and consideration in the preparation of the pleadings than has of late been the practice to bestow upon them; and henceforth instead of suitors being bewildered by ruinous and delusive pleadings, pleadings generating useless expense and affording no real information, we shall soon find that professional pleaders will be obliged to give more care and con-



sideration to the putting forth of the substantial merits of each particular case, to the avoidance of these eternal repetitions of time and place, which are produced and reproduced with an iteration not less tedious than expensive.

Regarding pleas (which are the answer by the defendant to the declaration of plaintiff), the practice will be also greatly simplified and improved by the new Rules. Defendants will no longer be allowed to plead deceptively the general issue, and take the plaintiff by surprise, nor will they be permitted (unless by leave of a judge), to traverse or deny more than one principal part of the plaintiff's right of action, unless the justice of the case should require a more extensive defence; and then the real points to be tried must be presented distinctly to the jury. Instead, therefore, of the hosts of witnesses which at present crowd our courts of justice in civil cases, we shall find that in ordinary trials one or two will suffice; and the trials of causes will be reduced to a third of the present expense.

It may be hoped that when the advantages of these improvements shall become apparent, our judges will not stop here, but go on simplifying and shortening all the dull, and endless forms of the Common Law. Nor should they omit the utter extirpation of that system of fiction so unnecessary, unmeaning, and so calculated to bring any science into contempt. The sooner "John Doe and Richard Roe" are "hanged by the neck until they are dead," the better for the judge, the jury, and for outraged and violated common sense.

In our next Number we shall say a few words on the advantage and necessity of Local Courts. Meanwhile we are glad to perceive that this question is again taken up by His Majesty's Government, and that they are determined to stand unanimously by Lord Brougham's Bill.

#### UNLIMITED DESIRE OF POWER.

POWER is a means to an end. The end is, every thing, without exception, which the human being calls pleasure, and the removal of pain. The grand instrument for attaining what a man likes, is the actions of other men. Power, in its most appropriate signification, therefore, means security for the conformity between the will of one man and the acts of other men. This, we presume, is not a proposition which will be disputed. The master has power over his servant, because when he wills him to do so and so,—in other words, expresses a desire that he would do so and so, he possesses a kind of security that the actions of the man will correspond to his desire: The general commands his soldiers to perform certain operations, the King commands his subjects to act in a certain manner; and their power is complete or not complete, in proportion as the conformity is complete or not complete between the actions willed and the actions performed. The actions of other men, considered as means for the attainment of the objects of our desire, are perfect or imperfect, in proportion as they are or are not certainly and invariably correspondent to our will. There is no limit, therefore, to the demand of security for the perfection of that correspondence. A man is never satisfied with a smaller degree, if he can obtain a greater. And as there is no man whatsoever, whose acts, in some degree or other, in some way or other, more immediately or more remotely, may not have some influence as means to our ends, there is no man, the conformity of whose acts to our will we would not give something to secure. The demand, therefore, of power over the acts of other men is really boundless. It is boundless in two ways; boundless in the number of persons to whom we would extend it, and boundless in its degree over the actions of each.—*James Mill.*

## GOVERNMENT PLAN FOR COMMUTING THE TITHES IN IRELAND.

THIS great subject has been at length opened to the consideration of Parliament; and if we may judge from the tone assumed and temper displayed at its opening, it will give rise to nearly as much discussion as any topic of the present Session, and be contested with as much firmness as any proposition which the Government have yet made to the House.

It would be a waste of words in us to enlarge upon the bitter rancour which this question of Tithes has infused into all ranks in Ireland—the Catholics deeming it cruel and degrading to be obliged to contribute towards the support of an heretical Church; and the Protestants insisting upon the payment of the uttermost farthing, with a spirit of rancorous persecution altogether unworthy of men professing *any* form of Christianity, but more especially one calling itself the Reformed Religion of the Gospel. The Tithe-war, as it has been most appropriately called, has been of longer duration than any national war of late times; and reflecting men of all parties seemed at length to be ready to admit, that until this war could be brought to a close there was no hope of repose or prosperity for Ireland. Accordingly, when the “extinction” and “abolition” of Tithes in Ireland was distinctly promised by Mr. Stanley—when he asked the Liberal Members of the Commons to give their support to the Irish Coercion Bill, those who *had* any confidence in Ministerial promises ventured to hope that, at the opening of the present Session, a measure for the “abolition” and “extinction” of Tithes in Ireland would really be introduced by the pledged Administration. Instead of this, the following are the resolutions which were proposed to the House by Mr. Littleton, on Thursday the 20th inst.; which we give verbatim:

1. Tithe compositions are to be abolished, and a land-tax of equal amount, and payable by the same persons, substituted, to be managed and collected by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests.

2. The land-tax is to be redeemable for a sum of money equal to four-fifths of the value of land in each county, as determined by a commission to be for that purpose appointed, together with such further sum as, reckoning the interest of money at  $2\frac{1}{2}$ d. per cent. per diem, may be required to make up for two years an annual income equal to four-fifths of the land-tax; or the land-tax is to be redeemable for so much land as shall yield annual rents and profits equal to four-fifths of the land-tax.

3. So much of the land-tax as shall remain unredeemed on the 1st of November, 1830, shall be converted into a real charge equal to four-fifths of the land-tax, and payable by the owner of the first estate of inheritance in the land, who shall be entitled to recover the whole amount over against his tenantry.

4. Such rent charges are to be redeemable or saleable for the best price to be had, not being less than the consideration for redemption of land-tax.

6. The tithe-owners are to be paid by warrants issued by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Ireland, and addressed to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. Such payments are to be of the amount of the compositions to which the tithe-owners may be severally entitled, subject to a deduction for the trouble, loss, and expense of collection. Such rate of deduction is to be variable for each county, and to be fixed by a commission, with reference to the average expenses and outgoings attendant on the collection of tithes in each county during the ten years from 1820 to 1830.

6. When redemption of land-tax or sale of rent-charges shall take place, the payments by warrants as aforesaid are to cease; the redemption or purchase-money is to be paid over to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, and yield an interest of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  d. per cent. per diem. The money is to be from time to time drawn out, and invested in land for the benefit of the tithe-owner entitled to the principal money.

That it is the opinion of this committee, that composition for tithes in Ireland ought to be abolished on and after the 1st day of November in the present year, in consideration of an annual land-tax, to be granted to His Majesty, payable by the persons who would have been liable to such composition for tithes, and of equal amount; that such land-tax shall be redeemable; and that out of the produce provision should be made in land or money, for the indemnification of the persons entitled to such composition.

Mr. Littleton's speech was an amplification of these resolutions, and a reasoning upon them which really made them more complex than in their original shape; and that was certainly needless. Whatever may be the talents of the present Administration, they appear to have none whatever for simplicity. Whether it is a Slave Emancipation Bill, a Church Reform Bill, or a Tithe Commutation Bill, complexity and ambiguity are sure to be its characteristics; and in this last of their efforts they are quite as distinguished in this respect as in their first. We will give a selection from some of the best speeches offered in reply, and then append a few comments of our own. The speakers in favour of the resolutions were Mr. Littleton, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Cutlar Fergusson, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Christmas, and Lord John Russell. The speakers against the resolutions were Mr. O'Connell, Mr. F. O'Connor, Colonel Davies, Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Bellew, Mr. Sheil, Mr. H. Crattan, Mr. Barron, Mr. Lalor, Mr. Walker, and Mr. O'Dwyer.

Mr. O'CONNELL said, that if the Secretary at War was now in his place, he should congratulate him upon not having yet brought in the army estimates; it was prudent not to have done so until the necessary information from his right hon. colleague in office, as to the measures to be pursued towards Ireland, were before the house; for until the whole extent and operation of the present measure were fully understood, no man could say to what amount it might be necessary to augment the army. (Hear, hear.) Of all the delusions which ever had been practised, he did not say designedly, the present was the most gross. Did the right hon. gentleman suppose that by calling it a land-tax, or an annuity, he could reconcile the people of Ireland to an impost which had become odious in their eyes? Ministers might be ignorant—he believed they were ignorant—of the present state of Ireland, and of the sentiments by which the people of that country were animated; but he confessed, that till he heard the speech of the right hon. secretary opposite, he had not supposed that the Government thought so lowly of the intellect of the people of Ireland as to suppose that a change of name would, in their estimation, alter the thing. He then proceeded to observe, that the effect of the tithe compositions hitherto had been to increase the number of tithe-payers—they had been exceedingly increased, and the painful necessity of paying tithes was carried into a class which that grievous impost had never before in a direct form reached. The poor day-labourers, living in villages, had

to pay for their miserable kitchen-gardens, for which they never paid before, produce and not land having been in all time preceding made titheable by law; but now the poorest man was made to pay for his half or three-quarters of an acre, which formed to him no more than a mere cabbage-garden. The right hon. gentleman seemed to have given himself a great deal of trouble to procure his various materials and to prepare the proposed bill, but he could assure him that his labour had been vain, and that, much as he might think of the measure, it would never produce any practical results. It had been often said that the people of Ireland had much to make them melancholy, and accordingly they were a melancholy race, but occasionally they were merry in their misery, and he would undertake to say that the new tithe bill would be to them a most fertile source of mirth; he could assure the right hon. gentleman that the bill would be received in Ireland with a shout of ridicule—with one universal laugh of derision. The next effect of the bill there would be, perhaps, much more melancholy. He would beg the house just to remember what had been the cause of the tithe agitation, and of how long a standing it was. About 74 or 75 years had elapsed since that oppressive impost had first led to decisive manifestations of discontent. There might have been during that long period occasional cessations, occasionally more or less, of violence or vigour, but the tithe agitations extended over a longer period than any one now alive could remember, certainly at intervals with something of that temporary lull which the Coercion Bill and similar measures had sometimes produced, but which only occasioned the original causes of discontent to break out with increased virulence. Government might now, if it thought proper, introduce one statute after another, and might at last make a law that no man should wag his tongue for any other purpose than to call tithes a land-tax, but it would never have the desired effect, and no measure really beneficial to the country could be matured so long as that house proceeded to legislate as it was then doing—in the dark. Witness what had been done in the case of the 60,000*l.* granted for the clergy on the express understanding that the said 60,000*l.* was to be recovered of the people; but what occurred?—a sum of 12,000*l.* was obtained, and the cost of collecting that amounted to 28,000*l.*, although they turned out the whole of the military force of the country for the purpose of collecting it, horse, foot, and marines; ay, even the marines were employed. The hon. and learned member then referred to the act of 1832, and observed that by that act the appeal was left in words to the payer, and in fact to the owner. By the present proposed bill the owner would be turned into a tithe proctor. He begged the owners of the land to remember that, and he begged the house to remember that the people of Ireland did not alone object to the amount of tithes paid, but to the application of the funds thence arising: the objection to tithes was double, and now that objection would mix itself with rents. "Landlords of Ireland," he exclaimed, "look to yourselves." He felt satisfied that the principle upon which opposition to tithes had hitherto been conducted would forthwith be applied to rents, for the people of Ireland would not regard the present measure as the smallest alleviation of their misery. Was there anything rational in the measure? What was common sense in Ireland? (Cheers and laughter.) He thanked hon. members for that cheer—common sense was not one of the ingredients which entered into the composition of that bill. The best way of viewing the question was to put a case:—Suppose there now was on the British throne a monarch like James II.—that that monarch had entered into a league with that once formidable personage the Pope. If under the influence of such a monarch a law had been passed giving all the property of the English Church to the Catholic clergy, would it not have been received by the people of England with indignation and abhorrence? It would be visited with their just vengeance, and what might be expected from the people towards those who sought to be the imitators of James? Let it not be supposed that he would refuse to provide for the present incumbents—on the contrary, he fully recognized their life interests, but tithes were no inheritance. As to the Protestant church establishment in those parts of Ireland where there were Protestants, he would not object to its being paid for by the state, but he could not understand the justice of any system which imposed upon a people the expenses of a

the advantage of which they did not require. In the time of the Stuarts the English Government sought to impose upon the people of Scotland a system opposed to the general sentiment of the people, and what ensued? The Scotch came forward with their good claymores, and put an end to the dispute in a summary manner. Would any one deny that the system of the church of England was as much opposed to the feelings of the people of Ireland as at any period it was to those of Scotland? Was it from these observations to be inferred that he desired to see the Catholic clergy put into possession of the tithes? On the contrary, he could inform the house that the Catholic clergy would not accept the tithes—they would not accept them. If the bishops accepted them the parish priests would not. If the parish priests did, the regular clergy would occupy their places, and perform divine service to multitudes indignant against those by whom they were taxed. He was entitled to speak of himself as the organ of a considerable portion of the Catholics of Ireland, and he could undertake to say that nothing would be more abhorrent to the feelings of the great body of the Catholics than acceptance of the tithes by the clergy. As to the proposed measure, it would be altogether ineffective; the amount of tithes paid must be diminished, if the Government did not mean to fortify agitation for repeal. He would propose to diminish the whole amount of tithes to the extent of two-thirds; the remaining third he would propose should be applied to the relief of the working classes by a diminution of the county cess, and for those uses of the poor against which no valid objection could be urged. Something of that sort would do infinitely more towards pacifying the discontents of the people of Ireland than any scolding speeches from the throne.

Colonel DAVIES confessed that he had heard the proposition of the right hon. Secretary for Ireland with feelings of great disappointment. (Hear, hear.) He contended that that house had no right to impose on the landlords of Ireland the obligation of paying the tithes, and he considered that the plan of Government, so far from allaying agitation in Ireland, would unite landlord and tenant in one common cause against the Government, who would still find it necessary to employ the military in the collection of tithes. (Hear.) In his opinion it was iniquitous to compel 6,000,000 of people to pay for the support of an establishment of which they disapproved. (Hear, hear.) If the same state of things existed in England as in Ireland, in less than a week there would be, not passive, but positive resistance. Had not the Irish, then, the same feelings as the English? (Hear, hear.) It was lamentable that in legislating for Ireland that house appeared to neglect every consideration of common sense, and treated the people as mere serfs. (Hear, hear.) These were his opinions: if he had expressed himself strongly it was because he felt strongly on the subject. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. COBBETT wished to know whether the hon. member for Wiltshire, who had stated that tithes were invented by fraudulent Popish priests, would tell him how it happened that when an honest reforming church, which held in abhorrence all the frauds of Popish priests, was established, tithes were still preserved? All the damnable errors of the Catholic clergy were cast aside by the ministers of the reformed church; they rejected the whore of Babylon with scarlet robes; they abolished the confession and extreme unction; they cast down the idolatrous images of the Catholics, but they kept tithes. (Hear, hear.) If ever fraud was committed it was committed by those who made what was called the reformation in the church. By whom was that act of robbery—the appropriation of tithes—first committed? By the Protestants; and that monstrous thing, on account of which people were now so much suffering, was created by the celebrated Reformation. It might be truly said, in the language of Scripture, "Our fathers eat our grapes, and our teeth are thereby set on edge." The hon. member for Dublin had stated that agitation had existed in Ireland for the last seventy years. The fact was, that agitation had existed in Ireland ever since the year when Elizabeth sent Protestant parsons into that country, and would exist until the tithes system and the established church were swept away. The best course which, in his (Mr. Cobbett's) opinion, the Government could adopt, was to purchase the free-  
 hold of tithes in Ireland. They might do so for a less sum than the twenty millions which they last year gave for the emancipation of the colonial slaves.

and the consequence would be, that satisfaction being spread throughout Ireland, that country would become a source of strength and wealth to England. The measure proposed by the right hon. Secretary for Ireland was so full of detail that he (Mr. Cobbett) would not presume to say, at the present moment, that it would do no good. Still he must state that he thought it too complicated, and that it would not remove the real causes of irritation in Ireland. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. H. GRATTAN contended that there would be no final adjustment of the tithe question effected by any bill founded on these resolutions. The resolutions left it open to give either money or land for the existing value of tithes; but the speech of the right hon. secretary made it clear that it was the intention of the Government only to give land. The proposition now before the house was founded on the report of the committee of 1832,—a report to which the Irish members were all opposed at the time. He would remind a noble lord opposite of a meeting of the Irish nobility, and the Irish landholders, which took place in 1822, in London, on the subject of tithes, at which the noble lord was himself present, and at which the arrangement proposed in these resolutions was absolutely rejected. That meeting agreed in the propriety of effecting a commutation of tithes in Ireland, but declared itself opposed to any project for purchasing land for the clergy in lieu of tithes. To him it appeared that there were two reasons on which it was impossible for Irish members to agree to this plan. The first was, that it appropriated a certain portion of land to the clergy; and the second, that it placed an improper assessment upon the value of tithe. It would make the clergy not only bad landlords but bad pastors. (Hear, hear.) Had the right hon. gentleman opposite taken into his consideration what each clergyman would get upon his scale of compensation? Taking the tithe at 1*l.* 5*s.* an acre, for 240*l.* tithe, a clergyman would get a farm of not less than 350 acres. Now that was a preposterous amount to give in compensation. As to the duty which the plan imposed upon the landlords, he would, as one of them, avow that he declined the honour of becoming a tithe proctor of the Government. But he would ask the Government whether they really expected that this plan would succeed? If they thought that it would, he could only say that he differed from them very widely, and he would briefly tell them why. A gentleman in Wicklow, when the last commutation bill was passed, asked one of his tenants whether he did not think that it would be effectual for its object. The tenant replied, "Sir, we have beaten the police out of the field—don't you think that we can beat you?" (Hear, and a laugh.) With that answer ringing in his ears, he would be a bold minister who gave his sanction to a bill founded on these resolutions. He advised the Ministers, instead of trying to conciliate either of the great parties in Ireland, to endeavour to conciliate the people of Ireland, and to consider their interests, and their interests alone. He was sure that with the assistance of a reformed Parliament, Ministers, if they would only have courage to put it to the test, would be able to settle this question satisfactorily. He paid a strong eulogium on the resolutions passed by the Irish landowners at their meeting in 1822, and insisted that they ought to be adopted by the committee instead of those now proposed to it. He concluded by proposing as an amendment a series of resolutions, which he said was founded upon them, and which, as well as we could collect them, were couched in the following terms:

"Resolved, that it is essential to the peace of Ireland that the system of tithes should be extinguished, not only in name but also in substance,—that we recognize the right of persons having vested interests in them, and declare it to be the duty of Parliament to make them a just compensation by means of a land-tax,—that we also recognize the liability of property in Ireland to contribute to a fund for the support of religion and charity, but think that such a fund should be different in collection, and lighter in its amount, than that now raised by the system of tithes. Resolved, that we are also of opinion, that the mode of application and distribution of that fund ought to be submitted to the decision of Parliament."

Lord J. RUSSELL said that the opinions which he had expressed at the meeting to which the hon. and learned gentleman referred still remained unchanged. (Hear.) He thought that he could easily reconcile them with this proposition of

tax in lieu of tithes, and of a permanent redemption of that land-tax afterwards. As the hon. and learned gentleman well knew, he differed from several of his colleagues in the Administration as to the appropriation of this property; but upon the question on which the hon. and learned gentleman had that night de-claimed he believed that there was no difference of opinion in the Ministry. The hon. and learned gentleman proposed that two-thirds of the present amount of tithes should be utterly abolished, and that the remaining one-third should be applied to the same purposes to which the grand jury cess was now applied; or, in other words, that it should be substituted in place of another burden to which the land was already liable. But this was nothing more than abolishing tithe altogether (hear, hear); it was a direct act of robbery, neither palliated nor disguised (great cheering)—it was a mere act of confiscation, which assumed the appearance of giving relief to the miserable and vexed occupiers of the soil, but which, if it should be adopted by the Legislature, would give relief to none but the affluent landholder. (Great cheering.) On the question of appropriation he might have the misfortune to express opinions at difference with those of some of his colleagues; but on this question he gave his vote in the full reliance that it would be in accordance with that of all the Ministers, and of the majority of that house, unless, indeed, they were prepared to abandon all the rights of property, and to say that all means, even the most illegal, even such as were attended with tumult and bloodshed, might be used to conduce to an end not less disgraceful and calamitous than the means employed to carry it were violent and unholly. (Great cheering.)

On the division, the numbers were—For the original Resolutions of Mr. Littleton, 219;—For the Amendment of Mr. Grattan, 42.

The plan of the Government respecting Tithes in Ireland, will therefore, we have no doubt, be persevered in: and the result will be a fiercer intestine war than ever, with more coercion to keep down rebellion, till the whole thing will break down by its own intolerable weight: and tithes, lay and church, be lost to their present owners for ever.

Were we not somewhat better acquainted with the secret machinery of Government than we were some few years ago, we should have thought it impossible for the ingenuity even of a Minister, to make so simple an affair so complicated. But this is a device continually resorted to for the purpose of appearing very profound, scrupulously just, and perfect master of the subject, by affecting to see clearly what no other person can even understand. If a speech be full of difficulties and unintelligibilities, it is sure to be pronounced a masterly piece of financial skill; because persons are unwilling to confess that they do not understand it: and praise can be bestowed without knowledge, while criticism requires at least investigation. It reminds us of the story told of an old, and no doubt, a very pious lady in Scotland, who returning from hearing some very popular preacher, whose great charm lay in the obsolescence of his words and the involved and intricate construction of his sentences, was pouring out her admiration on all sides: when being asked whether she understood the drift of his discourse, she frankly said: "O dear, no! It was far too sublime for such poor simple bodies as myself to understand. I don't pretend to that; but I admired it the more because it was so truly divine that it went beyond all human understanding."

The case of Tithes may, we think, be comprehended in a few brief sentences: It is a claim to the tenth of the gross produce of the soil, for the avowed purpose of maintaining the clergy of the Established Church, keeping all places of worship in repair, and relieving the poor

of the county. This was the triple appropriation of tithes in the Catholic Church before the Protestant Reformation: and considering that the clergy of those days divested themselves in most instances of private property, and became members of a corporation or community, to which they resigned all their individual wealth, there was, in this receipt and appropriation of the tithe, a return to the old principle on which it was originally granted to the Priests and the Levites; for of them it is said that they were granted tithes for their support, *because they had no other inheritance!*

It is impossible to conceive any thing more different from this, than the present state of the tithes. A large portion is claimed as the inalienable property of the Established Church of England, as a corporate body, though the private wealth possessed by many of its members is very considerable: but instead of this tithe being appropriated to the triple purpose of supporting the poor, repairing the churches, and maintaining the clergy, the two first objects have been utterly neglected; and immense funds are raised from the public to do what tithes ought to have done without such demands: while the whole amount is now absorbed by the clergy alone; not because, like the Levites, they have *only* the tithe for their inheritance; but in addition to many other sources of clerical emolument besides. Another portion, less in amount, has been alienated from the Church, and is now in the hands of lay inappropriators, who hold it as private property, and appropriate it to their own uses only.

• We conclude, then, that the latter is a property held upon the tenure of the institution of tithes; and that if the Legislature should at any future time decree the abolition of that institution,\* as Jewish and not Christian, which in reality it is, their right to compensation for loss by such abolition would be no stronger than the right of the Proprietors of East India Stock, the owners of West India slaves, or any other persons suffering by the abolition of any institution or state of things deemed to be a public evil. The right of the Church as a corporation to the tithes possessed by it, stands on exactly the same foundation: with this difference, that if the Legislature thought fit to decree that no one established form of worship should be patronized as national, but that all sects of Christianity should be placed upon the same level in the eyes of the State, the property of the Church would become at once the property of the State, without a shadow of a *right* to compensation in any individual of the clerical body; as the corporation itself being annihilated, there would be no corporate rights, and as to individual property in any thing that belongs to the Church, no one pretends to claim this.

The whole question then is one of national benefit, and that and that only should be done by which the nation would derive the largest share of relief. The present proposed commutation will leave most of the objections to tithe exactly where they stand; so that we think their entire extinction would be far better than their commutation. For this purpose, let a proper standard of valuation by so many years purchase be settled; and at that valuation let all lay inappropriation of tithes be bought up by annuities, chargeable on the public funds, and become the property of the Government. At the same time let the tithes payable to any member of the clergy now living, become at his death



the property of the Government without payment of any kind; and in cases where an annuity equal to their computed value by the scale settled, could be paid to the incumbent during his life for the interest he held in the tithes, let their whole produce be transferred to the Government at once. In the course of four or five years, the whole tithe property of the country would become the property of the state; and its redemption by proprietors of land being fixed at an easy rate of purchase money, in five years more the whole of England and Ireland might become tithe free; while a fund, from the sale of all the church and crown lands, tithes, &c., would produce, at the very lowest estimate, 100 millions sterling, with which fund the whole national debt might be placed on the footing of terminable annuities, by paying a higher interest for a fixed period only, or transferring the whole into life annuities, paying off those not content to accept the terminable instead of interminable interest, and selling only to those who would conform to the new terms.

By some such plan as this, tithes would become wholly extinct in twenty years at the farthest; and the national debt be reduced every year by the falling in of life annuities; and in forty years both tithes and national debt would become wholly extinct.

It may be asked, what then would become of the clergy of the Established Church? The answer is plain. All those now members of its body would be secured for their lives in the enjoyment of an annuity from the Government funds, bearing some fixed and uniform proportion to the actual money-value of the tithes as at present; and all persons wishing to enter the ministry of the Episcopal Church, would then be on the same footing as the ministers of every Dissenting body of Christians, dependant on their congregations for support. The cathedrals and churches, old and new, the parsonage houses, burying grounds, and all the existing buildings and materials might be given over to the Episcopalians; and this would of itself give them an immense advantage over all other sects. If they could not succeed under such circumstances in attracting congregations, in obtaining that decent subsistence above which the preachers of the Gospel should not aspire, let them then return to the still more primitive practice of the Apostolic ages, and labour with their own heads or hands, to sustain themselves, as is done by thousands of equally devout and honourable men.

We may refer to the Society of Friends in all parts of England, as furnishing beautiful examples of the most perfect purity of life and conduct, the most holy and unobtrusive zeal, and the exercise of all the virtues that can adorn the character of the pious Christian, or the upright man—without tithes, without priests, without pomp or power, or pretensions—with no machinery for the support of the most devout religion, beyond the Scriptures for perusal, the Supreme Being as an object of adoration, and the assembling together on terms of the most perfect equality, for reflexion, for prayer, for exhortation, and for worship, without the expenditure of a single shilling otherwise than as a private offering of him who gives, and without the receipt of a single shilling by those who either pray, or expound, or preach. To such patterns as these we refer the deans and prebends, the rectors and vicars, the bishops and the archbishops of the English and Irish hierarchy; and if

they would take the Gospel as their guide, the Saviour for their teacher, and his Apostles for their models of imitation, they would find that the nearer they approached the patterns we have pointed out as living in our own country, and in our own day, the nearer would they approach to the Divine Founder of their Faith; every word of whose Gospel is a reproof to the worship of that Mammon, whose tithes, pluralities, and livings, seem the great object of clerical contention and hierarchical care.

#### DOCTRINE OF PASSIVE OBEDIENCE.

THE doctrine of passive obedience is so repugnant to the genuine feelings of human nature, that it can never be completely acted on. A secret dread that popular vengeance will awake, and nature assert her rights, imposes a restraint which the most determined despotism is not able to shake off. The rude reason of the multitude may be perplexed; but the sentiments of the heart are not easily perverted.—*Robert Hall*.

#### NECESSITY OF LABOUR.

OR the laws of nature, on which the condition of man depends, that which is attended with the greatest number of consequences, is the necessity of labour for obtaining the means of subsistence, as well as the means of the greatest part of our pleasures. This is, no doubt, the primary cause of Government; for, if nature had produced spontaneously all the objects which we desire, and in sufficient abundance for the desires of all, there would have been no source of dispute or of injury among men; nor would any man have possessed the means of ever acquiring authority over another.—*James Mill*.

#### NATIONAL EDUCATION.

THAT it is the duty of a Christian people, to take care, that in some way or other, facilities are afforded for the instruction of its youth, we suppose few will dispute. The God who constituted the various relations of social life, has imposed the obligation. It is the order of His providence, that every successive generation of the human family, shall in this particular, as well as in many others, be dependent upon that which precedes it. The chain which thus binds together the children of men, cannot be severed:—the responsibility which the connection involves, can never be evaded. There are, it is true, a goodly number still to be found, who practically maintain the strange paradox, that it is not the will of God that all his rational creatures should be, in any enlarged sense of the word, intelligent. With such persons we hold no controversy. It would be a mere waste of words, to reason with men so incapable of estimating the dignity of their species,—so wilfully ignorant of the genius of the Gospel. The doubts of the weak, and the alarms of the timid, with regard to the consequences which may be expected to result from the general diffusion of knowledge, would be worthy of more respect, but for their *irreligious* character and tendency. God himself has explicitly declared, that “for the soul to be without knowledge is not good.” We dare not, therefore, sympathize with terrors which are founded in distrust of His wisdom, or venture to excuse precautions which would seek an imaginary security in the degradation of His creature. The plain truth is, that all objections to the education of the poor, come from what source they will, are, in their very nature, utterly antichristian. They may be invariably traced either to superstitious fear, or to unmixed selfishness. With the spirit of that religion, which is emphatically Light and Love, we repeat it, they have no communion.—*Eclectic Review*.

## REVERSAL OF THE VOTE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—CASE OF BARON SMITH.

---

WE are glad to see the House retrace the false step it took, in the case of Baron Smith, though it would have been well for its dignity and reputation if it had not been quite so precipitate at first. The arguments of the case were, we think, quite exhausted in the first debate; but a returning sense of duty to the independence of the Bench, and the excellent rule of testing the case, by supposing the political addresses of the Judge to have been in perfect harmony with the Accuser's opinions, seems to have operated powerfully in satisfying many that on their first vote they had done a wrong; and although this vacillation is not calculated to strengthen the confidence of the people in the first impressions of their representatives, yet it is evidently more to their honour that they hastened to repair the wrong they had committed, than if they had persisted in their error, for the sake of preserving an appearance of consistency.

The debate on the motion for discharging the order to appoint a Committee was opened by Sir Edward Knatchbull, who was very ably supported by Mr. F. Shaw, the Recorder of Dublin, and Sir Robert Peel; and the result of the division which followed the debate was, For Sir Edward Knatchbull's motion to discharge the order for a Committee, 161; For retaining the previous order, 155; leaving a majority of 6 against the Ministers, and thus rescinding the vote on Mr. O'Connell's motion, carried by so large a majority but a few nights before.

When we wrote the article contained in our last Number, on the case of Baron Smith, we expressed our belief that twelvemonths hence, many would regret having voted for the committee; but we had not the faintest hope that the conversion of those in error would have been so rapid, that on the very day following the passing of that article through the press, the judgment we had deprecated should have been totally reversed. This, however, is one of the benefits of judging of all cases by their abstract merits without reference to the names of the men, or the distinctions of the party by which they are advocated or opposed. This has been our rule of judgment hitherto: and by this, we hope always to be able to abide.

The case has excited, as may be supposed, the most intense interest in Ireland; and it will be an appropriate termination to the history of an affair, of which we are not likely, we think, in our day, to see a parallel, to give the subjoined address presented to Baron Smith, signed by an immense list of the professional gentlemen practising in his court, and most able to appreciate his conduct, with the learned Judge's reply.

## ADDRESS OF THE BAR TO BARON SMITH.

To the Hon. Baron Sir William Cusac Smith, Bart.

SIR,—Under existing circumstances, we, the undersigned members of the Irish bar, feel ourselves called upon, and readily come forward, to testify the respect which we entertain for the unshaken integrity, strict impartiality, and eminent talent, which for a long series of years have uniformly marked your judicial character.

(Signed by a long List of Professional Gentlemen.)

The above having been sent to Baron Smith in a letter from Serjeant Pennefather, as the senior member of those who subscribed the address, the following answer was received, addressed to Serjeant Pennefather :

*Ashfield, February 20.*

My dear Serjeant—I am more gratified than I find it possible to express by the import of your letter, and by the address which that kind letter covered. Against, I will admit, an unexpected shock, I have hitherto been sustained by the testimonies of my own conscience; but as this internal monitor is liable to be influenced by self-love, it is encouraging to collect, from the suffrages of so many and such distinguished members of the bar, that I have not been mistaking the suggestions of vanity for those of conscience.

What more need a judge desire than, that after an experience of many years, an enlightened body such as yours should spontaneously, and, “under existing circumstances,” I will add, generously come forward, to bear witness to the impartiality and integrity of his judicial conduct?

Upon what may not unaptly be called the law of my case the bar have offered no opinion, and I feel myself more than warranted in strictly following their example.

With that propriety and discretion which might have been expected from them, they have refrained from the expression of any opinion upon its merits. To all who can appreciate justly the judicious decorum of such a course, it must render their address of the greater value.

In me it would be worse than indecorous to assert that I have not been guilty of neglect of duty, or talked politics from the bench, or fomented a spirit of intolerance and religious discord. This would be not only to prejudge a question which may now perhaps be pending (before those whose right of discussing it their wisdom will weigh and well determine), but it would against all principle be to constitute myself a judge in my own cause.

But it is consistent with due deference to disclaim ill intention; and accordingly I may say, that I never meant to neglect my duty; but, on the contrary, very diligently, and even laboriously, to discharge it; that, so far from meaning to do more than recommend to submissive deference the genuine principles of our law and constitution—so far from meaning to promulgate the opinions or feelings of a party, I conceive my mind to be utterly free from every party tinge; and lastly, that so far from meaning to excite intolerance and discord, I imagined that through life I had rather carried my conciliatory propensities to excess.

But human judgment is extremely fallible, and whether my head has failed to execute the good intentions of my heart, is not for me, but perhaps for others, to decide. As many, however, as have signed the address to me have impliedly pronounced that I was not a lazy idler, a rancorous and mischief-making bigot, or knowingly a political partisan—for how could I be these, and be an honest and impartial judge?

I have ever preached respect to constitutional authorities, as opposed to those antagonistic and spurious powers, which experience tells us that agitation will produce; I have ever preached adherence to the fundamental principles of the constitution. In both instances I will endeavour to practice what I preach—never to violate that due respect which constituted authorities have a right to claim; nor ever to betray that independence of the Bench which is at once a principle and a bulwark of the constitution, and which I consider it a part of my judicial duty to maintain.

With a sentiment which ought to be, and will be as lasting as my life, of gratitude to you, and those who have honoured me with the address which this letter is written to acknowledge, allow me, my dear Serjeant, to subscribe myself with great respect,

Your and their obliged and faithful servant,

WILLIAM CUSAC SMITH.

#### GOVERNMENT LIABLE TO THE SAME TEMPTATIONS TO ABUSE THEIR POWER AS INDIVIDUALS.

Whatever would be the temptations under which individuals would lie, if there was no Government, to take the objects of desire from others weaker than themselves, under the same temptations the members of Government lie, to take the objects of desire from the members of the community, if they are not prevented from doing so. Whatever, then, are the reasons for establishing Government, the very same exactly are the reasons for establishing securities, that those entrusted with the powers necessary for protecting others make use of them for that purpose solely, and not for the purpose of taking from the members of the community the objects of desire.—*James Mill*.

#### NORLE EXAMPLE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

ALFRED the Great appears to have been the first person who ever set vigorously about the task of introducing the elements of learning among the English people. He complains, that on his accession, he knew not one person south of the Thames, who could so much as interpret the Service Book, and very few in the northern parts who had even reached that pitch of erudition. To remedy the evil, he established schools every where, for the instruction of all classes, and enjoined by law "all freeholders, possessed of two hydes of land or more," to send their children to them for instruction. Not content with this, he himself undertook to supply with books the schools he had opened, either by furnishing original compositions; or by making translations from the Greek; in each case seeking to convey instruction, not so much in the way of didactic essay, as by parables, stories, and apophthegms, at one time clothed in plain prose, at another couched in poetry. The civil dissensions which broke out at his death, put an early end to these excellent designs.—*Eclectic Review*.

#### PROPHETIC ANTICIPATION OF THE PRESENT TIMES.

THAT the seeds of public convulsion are sown in every country of Europe (our own not excepted) it were vain to deny—seeds which, without the wisest precautions, and the most conciliating councils, will break out, it is to be feared, in the overthrow of all governments. How this catastrophe may be averted, or how, should that be impossible, its evils may be mitigated and diminished, demands the deepest consideration of every European statesman. The ordinary routine of ministerial chicanery is quite unequal to the task. A philosophic comprehension of mind, which, leaving the beaten road of politics, shall adapt itself to new situations, and profit by the vicissitudes of opinion; equally removed from an attachment to antiquated forms and useless innovations; capable of rising above the emergency of the moment to the most remote consequences of a transaction; combining the past, the present, and the future; and knowing how to defend with firmness, and concede with dignity. These are the qualities which the situation of Europe renders indispensable. It would be a mockery of our present Ministry to ask whether they possess those qualities.—*Robert Hall*.

## THE MARQUIS OF CHANDOS'S RESOLUTION, FOR RELIEF TO THE AGRICULTURISTS.

ON Friday the 22<sup>d</sup>, a very long, heavy, and dull debate took place, on a motion of the Marquis of Chandos, submitting to the House the following resolution :

“ That in any reduction of the burthens of the country, which might be rendered practicable by the remission of taxes, due regard be paid to the relieving the distress of the agriculturists, which had been alluded to in the speech from the throne.”

The terms of this resolution are so moderate and so general, that we cannot see how any reasonable objection could be made to them. In any remission of taxes that may be found practicable, *every* interest deserves to have due regard paid to it ; and the agriculturists quite as much as any other. We should therefore vote for such a resolution without scruple ; and if instead of the word agriculturists, the words *ship-owners*, *manufacturers*, or any other term, designating any great class of his Majesty's subjects, had been used, we should just as readily have supported it ; because, if *all* the interests of the country deserve to have due regard paid to them, both in the imposition and the remission of taxes, then *every particular* interest must equally deserve such regard, inasmuch as the parts are necessarily included in the whole.

But in the House of Commons, as in the Courts of Law, there are almost as many fictions as facts ; and in both there is a sort of conventional phraseology, constituting almost a new language, so different are the meanings of the same words when spoken within and when uttered without the walls of the House. Taken in a parliamentary sense, this resolution of the Marquis of Chandos was meant to pledge the House that in the very first remission of taxes to be made, regard should *first* be paid to the distresses of the agriculturists, whose depressed condition had been exclusively the object of royal sympathy in the speech delivered from the throne. And who can wonder at all proprietors or occupiers of land thus responding to the royal expressions of condolence ? To what end were these expressions put into the mouth of his Majesty, if they were to serve no good purpose ? And what good purpose could they serve but that they should justify Ministers in first affording relief to that very interest thus admitted to be so peculiarly distressed ?

No doubt seems to be entertained that the object of the royal allusion was to allay any expectations that might have been indulged as to the revision of the Corn Laws, and to justify the Ministry in their resistance to all propositions for such revision in either House of Parliament. But to resist alteration, and oppose further change, will not do. The Corn Laws have existed for so great a length of time, that if pro-

tection to the agricultural interests, for which purpose they were alone instituted, and alone retained, could benefit them at all, they ought now to be in the fullest enjoyment of all its good effects. And so undoubtedly they are. To what, then, do these amount? To absolutely nothing! Nay, worse; for, according to their own admissions, the landed interests of the country were in a far better condition fifty years ago than now, after half-a-century of Corn Laws for protection have given them a monopoly of the whole of the English market for the sale of their produce. Are we surprised at this? Certainly not: it is in perfect harmony with the universal history of monopolies in every quarter of the globe. The monopoly of the East India Company lasted for two hundred years, and it ended in draining and impoverishing India to the lowest state of poverty and degradation, and involving the English Proprietors in forty millions of debt more than all their assets could pay. The monopoly of the West India Planters lasted for nearly the same period of time, and brought the West India interests into such a state of depression, debt, and embarrassment, that but for the grant of twenty millions by the Parliament for the purchase of their slaves, a general bankruptcy must have ensued; and even this sum will in many instances be insufficient to clear off incumbrances on their deeply-mortgaged estates. The branches of trade in this country that have been most bolstered up by bounties, monopolies, and protections, are those that have sunk into the lowest and most ruinous condition. And now, to crown the whole, the agricultural interest—the greatest and most important, we willingly admit, in every country of any great extent—with all the protection afforded to it, is in a general state of admitted ruin and decay.

What, then, is to be done? Merely taking off the Malt Tax instead of the House Tax will not do. It would give some relief, no doubt; but it would not lift up the landed interest from its present dead and prostrate condition to one of prosperity and life; and any thing short of this would be but a palliation of the evil. Some great, and general, and comprehensive measure can alone save them; and to that none of the Members of the present Administration seem to have the virtue or the courage to turn their attention. If we are asked, of what nature such a measure should be, we offer the following as an outline of some, at least, of its parts.

1.—To abolish or extinguish Tithes entirely, without commutation, compensation, or any other consideration, and declare all lands to be, after a given period, absolutely tithe-free: a measure which would add to the actual value of every landed estate in England by not merely the amount of the tithe saved, but by a riddance of all the vexations attending its collection.

2.—To make the assessment for the maintenance of the sick and helpless poor in hospitals and infirmaries, for the providing labour in public works for those who are able to labour but can find no private employment, and for the construction and repair of all the roads of the country, *general assessments* on the whole property of the kingdom, instead of *partial assessments* in local, parish, or county rates.

3.—To make some arrangement for annually diminishing, in a very slight but constantly progressive degree, the burden of the National Debt—to counterbalance the great advantages which the fundholders

have so long enjoyed, not merely over the landholders, but over every other class of his Majesty's subjects, by having bought in the funds at from 50*l.* to 60*l.* for 100*l.* of 3 per cents., and receiving therefore nearly 6 per cent. interest for very many years, with a power of realizing 90*l.* for what only cost 60*l.* at most, and enjoying at the same time all the advantages of the increased value of money, or the decreased prices of commodities, without their property being subject to any tax, impost, or drawback whatever.

4.—For all these immense benefits, to claim from the landowners, in return, an immediate removal of all protecting duties, and a perfectly free trade in corn.

But, the reader will exclaim, the total and immediate extinction of Tithe! What is to become of the lay-impropriators? and how are the Clergy to be maintained? We answer,—Let the lay-impropriators be compensated for the surrender of their individual property, by a grant from the state, as the West Indians have been, on such a scale as to leave them no worse, but to place them in no better a condition than they are at present. And for the Clergy, give the whole of the Episcopalian body, clergy and laity, all the cathedrals, churches, chapels, parsonage-houses, and buildings strictly ecclesiastical, and let the Episcopalian teachers appeal to the Episcopalian congregations for that support which it were an insult to them as well as to their flocks not to suppose that they would instantaneously obtain. The learned, the pious, and the moral among them would be sure to find followers and supporters: the traffickers and the money-changers, the fox-hunters and the pluralists, would be neglected. The number of pastors would be soon adjusted to the number of the flocks; and while no expense would be spared by congregations to see the teacher they loved and respected amply provided for, not a shilling would be asked of any one for the support of any other person than the preacher under whose ministry he sat, and from whom he derived the spiritual consolation of which he stood in need.

There is then *no* difficulty in the way of benefiting not merely the agricultural, but every other interest in the State, by some such plan as this, except the courage to undertake it, in which we believe the present Administration to be wholly deficient.

To return to the history of the debate. The Marquis of Chandos introduced the resolution already given, which was seconded by Sir Edward Knatchbull. Lord Althorp opposed the resolution, though he admitted the existence of agricultural distress. Mr. Baring supported the Marquis of Chandos; as did Sir John Wrottesley and Mr. Cobbett, the latter contending for the entire repeal of the malt-tax, as a measure of indispensable necessity. The following were the most remarkable portions of the speeches in the debate.

Mr. W. WHITMORE was understood to say that the monopoly which the corn-laws gave the agriculturists had not been found to produce the effect they had expected from it. He should vote against the motion of the noble marquis (Chandos), not because he was ignorant of the distress of the agricultural interest, but because he thought that the means proposed by the noble marquis for relieving that distress would not be effectual. He entirely concurred with the noble lord below him in thinking that more relief might be afforded the agricultural interest by removing local burdens than by repealing imposts which affected them in common with other classes of His Majesty's subjects; and he was glad to hear that the noble lord



had in contemplation some extensive measure with respect to the poor-rates. (Hear, hear.) The agricultural classes would also feel greatly interested in the introduction of any plan having for its purpose a fair commutation for tithe; for that particular species of impost constituted one of the greatest grievances under which the agriculturists laboured, by making it uncertain whether they would receive a fair remuneration for the outlay of their capital.

Mr. BENNET thought that the agricultural interest was entitled to the consideration of the Legislature. His Majesty's Ministers had thought proper to give partial relief to the country by repealing the house duty, while by repealing the malt-tax they had it in their power to benefit every interest in the land, for the abolition of that tax would not only be a boon to the farmers, but would enable the productive classes of the country to drink the wholesome beverage of beer at their own homes.

Mr. CLAY said he was ready to concur in the general proposition of the noble marquis (Chandos), that the landed interest should have the benefit of a fair proportion of whatever reduction in taxation the Government was enabled to make; but that proposition, innocent in itself, was rendered objectionable by the commentary which accompanied it. It had been declared, not only by the noble marquis, but also by the hon. member for Essex, that the agricultural interest would feel no benefit from the remission of the house-duty. He wished to know how this happened to be the case. Did not the farmers live in good houses, and the landlords in still better? (Hear, hear.) How came it, then, that the remission of the house-duty would be no benefit to them? Simply because it had hitherto been assessed with the most gross and shameful partiality. (Loud cries of "Hear.") This circumstance of itself furnished the noble lord (Althorp) with a most convincing argument for its repeal (hear), and if it were contended that houses in town acquired their value from their locality, that would only be an additional reason for the repeal of a tax which, from its very nature, could not be fairly levied. (Hear, hear.) The repeal of the malt-duty had been demanded on behalf of the agricultural interest, but he (Mr. Clay) was prepared to prove that its remission would be no direct relief to the farmer, but would only benefit him, in as far as it tended to increase the consumption of barley. But it did so happen that two measures having that effect had already been carried into operation, one wholly repealing the duty on beer, the other partially removing the duty on spirits; and he would state to the house what the result had been. In 1820 the consumption of malt amounted to 27,389,310 bushels, and in 1833 the quantity consumed up to the October quarter was not less than 40,164,792 bushels, being an increase of 44 per cent. on the consumption of malt. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member concluded by observing, that under these circumstances, he should vote against the motion of the noble marquis (Chandos).

Lord HOWICK did not intend to offer any observations to the house with reference to the question under discussion, but as the hon. member for Oldham had made some assertions which he called facts, he (Lord Howick) was anxious to give those assertions a very simple contradiction. The hon. member had made two distinct statements:—1st, that the poor-rate had decreased in amount since the year 1812; and 2d, that in direct proportion to the augmentation of taxation, an increase would always be found to take place in the amount of the poor-rates. On both those points the hon. member for Oldham was wrong; for since the hon. member had made his speech, he (Lord Howick) had referred to the returns before the house, and found that in 1812 the poor-rates amounted to 6,656,000*l.*, and in 1832, to 6,731,000*l.*, being an increase of nearly 100,000*l.* in the latter year. (Hear, hear.) But if the poor-rates had rather increased than diminished, what had been the case with respect to the taxation of the country? In 1812, the total amount levied in taxes was not less than 68,000,000*l.*, while in 1832 it did not exceed 46,000,000*l.*; so that while there had been a diminution of taxation to the amount of 19,000,000*l.*, the poor-rates, instead of diminishing (as, according to the hon. member for Oldham's statement, they ought to have done), had been increased by a sum amounting very nearly to 100,000*l.* (Hear.) This statement gave a very complete contradiction to the argument of the hon. member for Oldham; but the contradiction would have appeared more

striking if the hon. member had not singled out the year 1812; for the poor-rates were from particular circumstances higher at that period than in most years about that time. (Hear, hear.)

Colonel EVANS defended the Government for proposing the remission of the house-duty, the assessment of which was so regulated as to greatly favour the agricultural interests. The metropolis alone, he maintained, paid one-third of the whole house duty. It had been insisted by an hon. member that the poor-rates fell most grievously on the agricultural population; but he (Col. Evans) begged most distinctly to deny the correctness of such a statement. The rental of Yorkshire was somewhere about 4,700,000*l.*, and its poor-rates amounted to 450,000*l.*, while the metropolis, with an estimated rental of 5,700,000*l.*, paid 680,000*l.* This, he submitted, plainly showed that the burden pressed more heavily on the manufacturing than on the rural districts.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT referred to a county meeting held several years ago at Northampton, which had been attended by a noble lord, and who then stated his conviction that it was the duty of His Majesty's Government to repeal the malt-tax in order to give prosperity to the agricultural interests; but who, since he has become Chancellor of the Exchequer (hear, hear), had, it appeared, altered his views entirely upon that subject. (Hear, hear.) All that was now held forth in the shape of relief was a problematical abatement of poor-rates and a commutation of tithes. He (Mr. Cartwright) was ready to support the measures of Government as far as regarded those two questions; but he frankly confessed he was not at all sanguine as to their results. The agriculturists were much indebted to the noble marquis for the manner in which he had advocated their interests. His resolution was a temperate one; it only claimed relief when the financial state of the country could afford it, and he considered it his duty to vote in favour of it.

Sir HENRY WILLOUGHBY said that the real question before the house was, if taxes were reduced, what was the principle to guide us in their reduction? He freely admitted, both from the unequal pressure and a tacit understanding, the noble lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer could hardly avoid the repeal of the house-tax, though its repeal had been pressed rather hardly by the members for the metropolitan districts, but a higher question was at issue—what should be the general principle in reducing taxes? The agriculture is distressed; that is admitted on all sides. He should not stop to prove this. As to manufactures and commerce, he doubted their absolute prosperity. The report produced no such statement. The Vice-President of the Board of Trade could get no unequivocal declaration of such prosperity. As to the statements of the hon. member for Ipswich, the statements proved nothing but that the British people worked hard and long. A mass of raw produce was worked up, but at what rate of profit—that was the question. Was the rate of profit such as to add to the funds of labour, the capital of the country? Until this was proved, the hon. member established nothing but the fact of hard toil in certain great branches of manufacture. But how could the conflicting interests of agriculture and commerce be reconciled? If it was a question of the cotton manufacture, the hon. member (the Vice-President of the Board of Trade) would settle the matter in a moment; he would take off the taxes, direct and indirect, on the production of raw produce. Why not, then, relieve agricultural products, the most important of all—those that entered into the cost of producing all others? Why not remove taxes from corn—barley for instance? Why not the malt-tax? Every producer was concerned in their removal. Two advantages must flow—one the removal of a tax—and the second that the commodity may be grown cheaper, and the grower be enabled either to sell cheaper, or to sustain on easier terms a foreign competition, if hereafter the corn laws should be revised. As to the commutation of tithes, and the amendment of poor laws, no one more strongly advocated such measures; but he thought that no pecuniary relief would attend the agriculturist in the first instance, but more likely an additional cost, though the ultimate results might be most advantageous.

Mr. O'CONNELL assured the house he would detain it but a few minutes while he stated his opinion on the present motion. He would support the resolution

for two reasons—1st, because he was in favour, not only of the abolition of the malt-tax, but of every other tax bearing upon agriculture, and he was well convinced that the noble Chancellor of the Exchequer would never give up a tax unless he was compelled to do so. His other reason was, that if the present resolution were carried, the hon. member for Worcester (Mr. Robinson) would come forward with his proposition respecting the pressure on the shipping interest. The noble Chancellor of the Exchequer had professed the principle of yielding to this kind of pressure, which he denominated unpopularity. The unpopularity of a tax was, it seemed, a reason for its repeal. (Hear.) He would ask, had not this wisest of all nations in the world committed the grossest of blunders with respect to the national debt? For 1,000*l.* borrowed at 20*s.* in the pound they now paid 30*s.* (A laugh.) That was the plain English of the matter. This wisest nation on the face of the earth increased the value of the currency by one half, in order to pay off the national debt. (Hear.) What absurdity to talk of the reduction of taxation affording no relief to the country! Was the old proverb forgotten that a shilling saved was a shilling gained? He had heard most learned discourses from more than one hon. member which were directed to prove that no relief would be thus afforded. He should like to try whether that would be the case. (Laughter.) There was a solecism in the Chancellor of the Exchequer which seemed to him (Mr. O'Connell) quite inexplicable. He had asserted, and the assertion had been repeated by many, that the commercial interest was in a thriving condition, while the agricultural interests were in a state of depression. England, Scotland, Ireland, all seemed to agree in this fact. Even Ireland, though she disagreed upon almost every other thing, was unanimous upon it. (A laugh.) What, then, was the conclusion? Why, that relief would be given to the agriculturists, and none to the commercialists. (Cries of "No, no.") That was the plain English of it. Scarce a man in the country, except the fundholders, received one-third of the income he had during the war. No man certainly more than one half. ("No, no.") He could answer for such being the case in Ireland at least. Why, he would ask, should the proprietors of the national debt receive an income three times increased? Why should they receive three times the quantity of meat? The only radical remedy for the evils of the country was to reduce the interest of the national debt—to strike off at least one-sixth, and that would be a very moderate mode of dealing with it. Talk of the cant of national faith indeed! He contended that national faith, so called, was national injustice. (Hear, hear.) Come to the reduction of the interest of the debt we must at last, and therefore all persons' minds ought to be made up to some such measure. Every interest in the country was in a suffering condition. Despair and darkness, except where relieved by incendiary fires, reigned throughout the land. Put a stop to these evils by the only mode—reduce the interest of the debt by one-sixth, and if at the end of twelve months that reduction should be found insufficient, come forward again and propose a reduction to a like amount. That at least would be doing something for the country. The noble Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose poetic imagination nothing could exceed, had described *in prospectu* the prosperity of the country. His fertile fancy had wandered over her green and sunny fields. He (Mr. O'Connell) admitted his genius and admired his invention. But the noble lord never dreamt of lessening the interest of the national debt. He only presumed as far as effecting a few trifling reductions in taxation; but by his (Mr. O'Connell's) plan something substantial would be effected. It was full time to begin; and whenever the proposition was brought forward, it should have his support as readily as he now supported the motion of the noble marquis. (Hear.)

MR. STANLEY begged the indulgence of the house for a few minutes, and would endeavour to keep his time more exactly than the hon. and learned member had done. He was far from disputing many of the propositions which had been enforced by the noble marquis, nor could he deny the existence of agricultural distress, corroborated as it was by the report of the committee of last year, and by the expressions of His Majesty's speech on the opening of the present session of Parliament, and if the proposition under the consideration of the house were merely confirmatory of that fact, he (Mr. Stanley) could not deem it either a

very useful or a very desirable proposition. It seemed, indeed, to him to have no specific effect, but to have been introduced merely for the purpose of raising an angry discussion. Let it not be supposed that he was disputing the facts, but he must be allowed to doubt the judgment and propriety of introducing such a motion to the house as that which was under discussion. For, what was proposed to be done,—what was to be the practical effect in the event of the house agreeing to the motion? Let hon. members consider the point well. Let them consider the grounds on which the proposition had met the concurrence of the hon. and learned member for Dublin. He was not pretending to impute similar motives to any other hon. member who had thought fit to support the motion, but he was curious to know, if by a combination of various interests it were to be carried, in what situation the house would be placed with regard to the reduction of taxation and the future prospects of the country. (Hear, hear.) He besought hon. members to consider this point. The proposition was supported by different persons on very different grounds, but the result of its success would certainly be universal confusion. (Cries of "No, no.") Might he be allowed then to inquire what was intended to be done in the event of the success of that motion? The hon. and learned member for Dublin had told them that his noble friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer would never give up any tax unless he were driven, pressed, and forced to the utmost. Now, this he (Mr. Stanley) thought a fault to which his noble friend was not peculiarly liable. Nay, he had confessed only the other day that he carried the reduction of taxation to too great an extent, and that it was solely owing to the elastic resources of the country, which made up the deficiency, that considerable financial embarrassment did not ensue. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Dublin had said he would vote for the resolution. Why? because he expected it would be followed by the immediate abolition of the malt-tax. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Stanley) was well aware that such an act would be popular; that the tax was of very large amount, and occasioned considerable pressure on the landed interest. But the interests of Ireland, about which the hon. and learned member always seemed peculiarly solicitous, surely her interests would not be advanced by the repeal of the malt-tax? (Hear, hear.) He would put it to the right hon. member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel) whether he was prepared to support the proposition of the hon. and learned member for repealing the malt-tax,—to that right hon. member who asserted that 1,200,000*l.* were all that it was possible to take off from the burdens of the country by a diminution of taxation? He would ask another hon. member, the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Baring), who had bitterly reproached the Government for encroaching on the diminished margin of taxation, whether he was prepared to favour the abstraction of 5,000,000*l.* from the interest of the national debt? A partial reduction of the malt-tax would not afford that degree of relief to the agricultural interest which some hon. members might expect. To take off half the tax would not be a removal of half the burden, for the expense of collection would remain pretty nearly as at present. By taking off the whole tax you took away more than the tax itself, because you also got rid of the entire cost of collection; but take off part of the tax, and you fail to afford a proportionate relief. The right hon. gentleman then proceeded to say, that a more conclusive and satisfactory statement than that which the house had just heard from the hon. and learned member for Dublin he had never witnessed—a statement in the course of which the learned gentleman showed that he was prepared to provide for what the hon. member for Essex once denominated "the margin of taxation" by a direct encroachment on the interest of the public debt. (Cheers.) This was the learned gentleman's mode of filling up the margin. (Hear, hear.) The hon. and learned gentleman proposed an immediate reduction of one-sixth of the interest of the national debt, and if that should not be sufficient, he would reduce another sixth in twelve months. He had heard the other night with surprise some mention made of "the pretext of an act of Parliament;" but with infinitely more astonishment did he now hear the learned gentleman talk in a British Parliament of "the cant of national faith!" (Loud and very significant cheering.) He granted that the mode in which the present repetition of that expression was received, and the tone of contemptuous derision with which it had been originally met when gravely stated and put forward by the learned gentle-

man, fully vindicated the house from the charge of partaking in any such absurd and profligate opinions. (Renewed cheering.) He owned "profligate" was a very strong expression—of course he meant "profligate opinions" in the sense of principles leading directly to acts of political profligacy—but he could not make use of a lighter term when characterising the sentiments referred to. (Hear, hear.) He rejoiced to hear the tone of derision with which the House had received the hon. gentleman's observation, inasmuch as that unequivocal expression of feeling saved the house from all suspicion, vindicated it from the imputation of participating in the sentiment, and sustained within the walls of Parliament, not "the cant," but the high principle of integrity, and national faith and honour. (Loud cheering.) He had merely risen for the purpose of commenting on the learned gentleman's expression, and also to call the attention of the house to the fact that a great number of those who were prepared to form part of what he expected to be the majority, might do so without entering into every financial consequence, but simply because they would not, by so large an abolition of taxation, endanger the national honour, which they were determined to uphold and vindicate. (Cheers.) He should only add, that according to every maxim of political prudence, the house ought not to accede to a resolution on the ground that it merely contained the assertion of a truism, without being prepared to follow out the principles of that truism in the way which its supporters advocated. (The right hon. gentleman concluded amidst loud cheering.)

Sir Robert Peel followed Mr. Stanley, and in the same strain of denunciation and invective against Mr. O'Connell, for his sneer at the obligations of national faith. That this expression of Mr. O'Connell was extremely reprehensible, no one, we think, will venture to deny. The national faith ought to be kept, strictly, rigidly, honourably; though it would of course be an open question to consider at any time, to what that national faith was really pledged—to see whether its bond had not already been more than fulfilled; and to submit the whole amount of our just obligations to a strict and searching investigation. But to call a sincere and honourable desire to fulfil the just obligations of the country "the cant of national faith," is language that deserved all the reprobation it has obtained. Mr. O'Connell is perpetually getting into these equivocal positions, and thus greatly weakening the power he might otherwise command, by his being so much the creature of impulse that he gives way to the feelings of the moment, and makes the assertion which seems to him best calculated to serve the purposes of that moment, utterly regardless as it would seem of all future consequences. In this respect Mr. Cobbett and Mr. O'Connell strikingly resemble each other; and hence the variety of opinions entertained by them at different periods; hence the frequent contradictions which their statements receive; and hence their constant oscillation between the two points of great popularity and great confidence on the one side, and great unpopularity and great distrust on the other: seldom retaining a fixed position in general estimation for any great length of time, but rising or falling as their conduct and their expressions are favourably or unfavourably viewed and received. Sir Robert Peel, with that skill of which he is so great a master, turned this unjustifiable expression of Mr. O'Connell to such a purpose, as greatly to influence the division which followed; and to give the question of the Repeal of the Union the hardest blow that it has yet received, we think, since its agitation; and one under which (however unreasonably) it will for a long time stagger, and require months of discreet and prudent conduct on the part of its advocates to

regain even the position they held before the blow was given. Speaking of Mr. O'Connell,

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, he was not sorry, however, that the hon. gentleman had avowed his political creed. (Loud and marked cheering.) When we came to consider the question of a Repeal of the Union between England and Ireland we should be able to collect what political principles would be likely to prevail in the event of that measure being conceded. (Cheers.) Oh! (continued the right hon. baronet) oh! all you who are interested in the public funds in Ireland; oh! all ye Protestants who hold lands or other property in Ireland, learn by this indiscreet declaration of the hon. gentleman what you have to expect when you shall be handed over to the tender mercies of a popular assembly in which the influence and principles of the learned gentleman prevail. (Vehement and continued cheering.) "Cant!" exclaims the learned gentleman—"Cant!" (turning round and fixing his eyes on Mr. O'Connell) "I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word." (Great cheering and laughter.) You have decided the question of the repeal of the union by this preliminary declaration. (Renewed cheering.) Oh! I know every man who has property of any description—who has any interest in the national funds, that on such slender pretences of state necessity rests the doctrine which justifies a violation of national faith—a doctrine which, being once established, no description of property is any longer safe. (Repeated cheers.) Therefore, though I vote with the hon. and learned member, I cannot avoid expressing strongly my abhorrence of his principles. (Cheering.) The right hon. baronet proceeded to say, that he was not prepared to admit that, as a necessary consequence of a compliance with this motion, a violation of national faith must follow: still less did he mean to imply that he was ready to grant any relief to the agricultural interest at the expense of disturbing the confidence reposed in national faith.

The result of this debate was a second defeat of Ministers, for the numbers, on a division, were—For the Marquis of Chandos's resolution, 202; Against it, 206; leaving to the Ministers only a majority of four, in a House of 408 Members, besides the four tellers. If Mr. Harvey's minority of eight on the Pension List, in a House of 376, was a defeat of the Ministers—and every one so considers it—the still smaller minority of four in a House of 412, must be a still more marked victory; and when to these two are added the actual majority of six against Ministers, on Sir Edward Knatchbull's motion for rescinding the resolution respecting Baron Smith, the position and duration of the Ministry seem very precarious indeed.

#### DILEMMA OF THOSE WHO OPPOSE THE EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE.

It is no longer deniable that a high degree of knowledge is capable of being conveyed to such a portion of the community, as would have interests the same with those of the community. This being the only resource for good government, those who say that it is not yet attained stand in this dilemma; either they do not desire good government, which is the case with all those who derive advantage from bad; or they will be seen employing their utmost exertions to increase the quantity of knowledge in the body of the community.—*James Mill.*

#### DIFFERENCES OF THE EFFECTS PRODUCED BY FREE AND ARBITRARY GOVERNMENTS.

On a comparison of free with arbitrary Governments, we perceive the former are distinguished from the latter by their imparting a much greater share of happiness to those who live under them; and this in a manner too uniform to be imputed to chance or secret causes. He who wills the end, must will the means which ascertain it.—*Robert Hall.*

## LIBERTY OF THE PRESS—THE BRIGHTON GUARDIAN AND THE DUBLIN PILOT.

DURING the last week, two cases of aggravated cruelty and severity came before the House, connected with the Freedom of the Press, which excited, it is true, some indignation, but not a tenth part of what it ought to have created in the breast of every Member of the Representative Assembly, and in the heart of every Editor of a Public Journal in the Kingdom. The case of Mr. Cohen, confined in the jail of Chelmsford, for a paragraph the most harmless—and the case of Mr. Barrett, not merely confined in jail, but having his paper entirely suppressed, for publishing a letter of Mr. O'Connell, containing not a word more than he might have spoken in his place in Parliament, and had reported in every journal in England, Scotland, and Ireland—may become the cases of the most careful and independent Editor of any English or Irish paper to-morrow. It is high time, indeed, that the Law of Libel should be improved; for the history of no nation with which we are acquainted presents such flagrant contradictions as the frequent boast and professed admiration of the Freedom of the Press in England, and its perpetual invasion and violation by attornies, judges, and juries, acting under the sanction of our execrable Libel law. The following statements will speak for themselves:

Mr. WIGNEY presented a petition from Mr. Cohen, the proprietor of the *Brighton Guardian*, now a prisoner, confined in Chelmsford gaol, for an offence against the libel law. The petition set forth the paragraph for which a bill of indictment had been preferred against the petitioner, charging him with having published the paragraph with the intention of inciting the lower orders to acts of incendiarism, and of maliciously attempting to bring the magistrates of Sussex into contempt, and stated that no inquiry was ever made of the petitioner touching the authorship of the paragraph; that five months elapsed after the insertion of the paragraph, during which period two several grand juries had been sworn at the winter gaol delivery and the quarter sessions, before any charge was preferred against him; and that such was the harmless nature of the paragraph, that not a single fire took place in Sussex during the whole of the winter which followed upon its appearance. (Hear.)

Sir C. BURRELL suggested to the hon. member the propriety of postponing the presentation of the petition, as it was one of a peculiar nature, until some member of the Government was present to answer it.

Mr. WIGNEY felt happy the opportunity was afforded him of stating that due notice had been given of his intention to present it. The petitioner proceeded to state, that the bill was presented by one magistrate of the county to a grand jury of twenty out of the twenty-three of which it was composed, and of which he himself was one, and that a true bill was found against him. He was accordingly tried, found guilty, and sentenced to be imprisoned in Chelmsford Gaol six months, to be fined 50*l.*, and find sureties, himself in 100*l.* and two others in 50*l.* each, for three years. Great ingenuity must have been resorted to to find out the libel contained in the paragraph, for although it only contained thirty-two lines, it was made the ground of not less than eight specific charges, and the opinion of Mr. Justice Parke, when the petitioner was called up to receive judgment, was delivered in the following words:—"These intentions are imputed to you; and,

in point of law, the jury may have been considered as having convicted you of all these intentions charged; and if the Court were really satisfied that it was your intention to incite the labouring classes to commit violence, the punishment which the Court would inflict on you would be much more severe than it will be; but considering what passed at the trial, I do not think the jury intended to find you guilty of that intention." The petitioner complained, that although when he was brought up to receive the judgment of the Court of King's Bench he produced affidavits in mitigation from several of the magistrates ~~said~~ <sup>and</sup> have been libelled, and although the charge of inciting to acts of incendiarism was totally abandoned, the above-mentioned most grievous sentences <sup>was</sup> pronounced upon him. He further complained that if an individual had occasion to question the conduct of a magistrate in his magisterial capacity, he must have given one month's notice of action, which allowed an interval to tender compensation; but this was denied to a private individual. He also complained that a power should be given to private individuals to prosecute that which, if it were an offence at all, was one of a public nature, as none but an officer of the Crown was permitted to prosecute offences committed against the Stamp Acts; and further, that his principal weapon of defence was wrested from him by the overruling of the learned judge. He therefore respectfully submitted that these facts called for the special notice of the Legislature, with a view to the adoption of such amendments in the law of libel as would protect from a system of heartless persecution those of His Majesty's subjects who, in the discharge of an onerous public duty, might feel themselves called upon to differ from the Executive, and to expose its incapacity or its treachery, and prayed that the house would adopt measures for his release from gaol, and make such alterations in the law as to protect publishers from the vindictiveness of the wicked. He (Mr. Wigney) could assure the house that the punishment fell with unusual severity upon the petitioner, who was a most industrious individual, and was the sole provider for his mother and family, and that the circumstance of his being imprisoned in a gaol situate in a different county and, at a great distance from his house, added considerably to the hardship of the case. This was one of the numerous instances that had occurred to show the necessity of a change in the present law of libel, and he trusted the subject would be seriously considered by the Government, and that the relief prayed by the petitioner would be extended to him.

Mr C. BURRELL could not help expressing his regret and surprise, after the notice that had been given, that there was not one member of the Government present to take notice of the complaints of the petitioner. He could only attribute it to some extraordinary press of business, that necessarily prevented their attendance. As the hon. member for Sussex was not then in his place, and being himself one of the magistrates of the county at Horsham, he would trouble the house with a few observations. He felt it to be his duty to inform the house, that the petitioner, who came forward to-day under the garb of an innocent man, had on two several occasions been convicted of libels on different individuals. (Hear.) The petition ought not to be received blindfold by the house, before they were made a little acquainted with the character of the individual from whom it sprang. In his judgment much of the agricultural distress, which had occasioned the prevalence of incendiarism in the county of Sussex, arose in a great measure from the wages paid to the labourers, and he regretted very much that the Labour-rate Bill, which he had the honour to introduce last session, had been rejected. He felt convinced that the enactment of such a measure would tend in a great degree to remedy the evil, inasmuch as throughout the whole country there had not been a single instance of incendiarism in those places where a Labour-rate Bill had been put in force. He begged to say that the petitioner was quite unknown to him, but from what he had heard of his character, it was liable to much animadversion, so far as the question of libel was involved.

Lord W. LENNOX said that the question before the house was not whether the petitioner had been previously found guilty of publishing private libels, but whether in the present instance his punishment did not exceed the offence for which he was now suffering incarceration in Chelmsford gaol. His lordship had no personal motive in the manner, or any predisposition in favour of Mr. Cohen,



who, since he had been the editor of the *Brighton Guardian*, had been most lavish in his attacks upon his lordship's family; but he nevertheless thought that in this instance the utmost severity had been adopted towards the petitioner, who in the first place denied being the author of the paragraph. Mr. Justice Parke had entirely exonerated the writer of any intention of committing the diabolical charge attributed to him, of attempting to excite the peasantry of Sussex to acts of incendiarism; and yet from the month of March to the middle of November the editor had suffered under the scandal and opprobrium inseparable from so foul an accusation. 'There was another fact which ought to be borne in mind, which was, that although previous to the publication of the libel there appeared a disposition in the minds of the misguided peasantry to renew the devastating scenes of 1830 and 1831, not a single fire took place in Sussex during the whole of the winter which followed.'

Mr. O'CONNELL said there had been more prosecutions for libel under the present Government, to endeavour to put down the liberty of the press, than under any former Administration; and he had no doubt, if the system continued, that the house would receive petitions from every editor in the metropolis, praying for a convenient place for their general incarceration. (A laugh.)

Mr. SHEIL said there could be but one feeling upon the absence of every Minister on the present occasion, particularly after the agreement that was made at the commencement of the session. Petitions were presented for two purposes—to state grievances to the public through the medium of the house, and to obtain the answer of the Government in each particular case. The reference that had been made to the law of libel induced him to take the earliest opportunity to make a statement of a fact upon which he felt assured that the British Legislature would take strict and immediate measures. Richard Barrett, the proprietor of the *Pilot* (hear, hear), was prosecuted for the publication of a letter bearing the signature of Daniel O'Connell. The prosecution was instituted after the Jury Bill had been introduced. The trial went off for want of jurors, and came on again after the act had passed, but before it had come into operation. It was strongly pressed that the trial ought to be postponed until after the 1st of January, because the Jury Bill would then come into operation, and such a jury would then be obtained as a law would enable the question to be fairly tried. That proposition was refused. The Clerk of the Crown gave a list of forty-eight names, out of which twenty-four were to be selected. Among this number there were only four Roman Catholics: those four gentlemen were struck off by the Crown Solicitor, and the case went to a jury, who, to make use of a vulgar phrase, were packed. The defendant was found guilty, with a recommendation to mercy, and was sentenced by the Court to be imprisoned six months. The Government had since availed itself of an act (55 Geo. III., c. 80), passed in 1815, and had issued an ordinance (he used the word "ordinance" because the act bore analogy to an ordinance issued elsewhere) to prevent the individual from obtaining a further supply of stamps, and he was now not only deprived of his liberty but his very subsistence. (Hear, hear.) He did not now appeal to the Government, he appealed to public opinion,—he appealed to British sentiments, and no doubt those feelings of "just indignation," of which the Royal breast did not possess the monopoly, would be evoked from the hearts of the public at so scandalous,—if it were not unparliamentary he would have given vent to the impetuosity of his feelings,—but he would say, unjust and despotic a proceeding. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. WILKS had expressed his deep regret at the proceeding the moment he beheld the announcement, but in the absence of the Government he felt it due to them to say, that no discretion was left to the Commissioners of Stamps, who were specifically directed by the compulsory clause of the act to furnish no more stamps to any individual who should have been found guilty of publishing a seditious libel. The words of the act were specific on the point, and he contended that no commissioner could have supplied Mr. Barrett with stamps without a direct violation of the act. (Hear.) He deeply regretted, and every man who advocated the liberty of the press must also regret, that such a clause should dis-

grace the statute-book, and he trusted, now the attention of the house had been drawn to it, it would be speedily repealed. (Hear.)

Mr. O'DWYER said it was impossible the distributor of stamps in Ireland could have been aware of the clause contained in the Act of Parliament, if it had not been made known to him by means of the Government. He denied, however, that its enforcement was absolutely necessary, inasmuch as no penalty was attached to a non-enforcement of the law. It was, nevertheless, important to observe, that this was a seditious libel, and the act only applied to such a case. If, therefore the word "seditious" had not been introduced into the indictment, the act could have had no application to the case of Mr. Barrett. He had carefully examined the indictment, and he would defy any lawyer to say that the word was not complete surplusage. He would not say more at present than express his deep regret at the conduct of Government, and his sympathy with the situation of Mr. Barrett, as he had a notice on the books on the subject. He thought the greatest hardship in the case before the house was, that he had not the benefit of being tried by persons in his own class of life.

Major BEAUCLERK said that no person could feel more indignant at the course pursued by the Government than himself, yet it would only be in his opinion an act of common justice to wait until some one of the Ministers was present to defend their conduct. (Hear, hear.) He thought a great allowance should be made for the period at which the attacks contained in the paper of which the petitioner was the proprietor were made. The house could not be ignorant of the fact, that at the period when incendiarism was so prevalent *The Times* and the *Morning Chronicle*, as well as many other journals, contained more frequent and more violent attacks upon the conduct of individuals, which were wielded with a much more powerful pen. The question, however, before the house was purely a question of compassion, and he hoped, after what the petitioner had already endured, they would consent to remit the remainder of the sentence.

Sir Charles Burrell, the only member who speaks against the character of Mr. Cohen, does not attribute the fires of the incendiaries to anything that appeared in his paper, but to the failure of his own Labour-rate Bill, which the House of Commons would not pass. It would be, therefore, more reasonable to punish the majority of the House of Commons for rejecting the Labour-rate Bill, and thereby causing these fires, as Sir Charles Burrell alleges, than to punish Mr. Cohen for having written a paragraph which no one ever supposes to have been the cause of any single act of incendiarism; but the effect of which paragraph, if it had any effect at all, was to prevent such fires, since not one happened in all the winter that followed its appearance! The whole proceeding is characterized by a barbarity suited only to the meridian of Constantinople: while that pursued towards Mr. Barrett is as worthy of Algiers. The absence of all the Ministers, after due notice given them by Mr. Wigney, of his intention to present the petition, seems to add insult to cruelty, and was at least a neglect which would have been loudly denounced by the men now in office, if proceeding from their predecessors on the Treasury benches.

We have been confined to a sick room during the greater part of the week, and have been unable to attend either the morning or evening sittings of the House until Tuesday; but our regret at being absent on this occasion is softened by the assurance that it is impossible such grievances as these should not be speedily and effectually redressed, for neither of them can possibly be permitted to drop here.

---

## LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF THE DISSENTERS.

THIS measure was introduced to the House by the noble lord on the evening of Tuesday the 25th, pursuant to notice previously given; and considerable interest was felt on the subject by a large number of Members. From the state of the Notices on the List for the evening, it was hardly expected, however, that it would come on: as there stood before it, Mr. O'Connell's motion for leave to bring in a Bill for the better regulation of the Corporation of Dublin, which was expected to occupy a large portion of time; and Colonel Evans's motion for a total repeal of the Window Tax, which was expected to consume the remainder of the night. So much importance, indeed, was attached to this motion, that there had been a meeting at Lord Althorp's of the principal adherents of the Ministry, to consider of the course to be pursued on this question, when it was resolved to oppose it with all their strength, and to confine the remission to the House Tax as originally announced. Mr. O'Connell's notice, however, did not occupy half the time expected, and was ultimately withdrawn by him altogether; and when Colonel Evans was next called on by the Speaker, and all eyes were directed to the place where he usually sits, no answer was made, and the honourable Member was not to be found. No friend appeared to explain the reason of his absence, or to assign any motive for the not bringing on the motion; nor did the honourable Member make his appearance during all the remainder of the evening—a circumstance which excited not a little observation and surprise.

The Speaker, after waiting a short time, finding no one to answer for Colonel Evans, called next on Lord John Russell, whose name stood next on the List; and as the noble lord's statement of his views and objects, and of the particular details of his Bill, were given with great clearness, we insert the report of his speech entire.

LORD J. RUSSELL said he rose for the purpose of moving for leave to bring in a bill for the relief of persons dissenting from the church of England, in regard to the celebration of marriages. It was well known that for a long time past Dissenters had complained of the grievance which they suffered, and the violence done their consciences in being obliged for the purpose of contracting marriage, to appear before a minister of a church from which they dissented, and to go through ceremonies inconsistent with their own forms of faith. It was likewise felt by many ministers of the established church as a most painful duty to have to perform the marriage ceremony on persons dissenting from the church, who, as most frequently happened, disregarded the ceremony, and very often, protested against it at its conclusion. Such being the feeling on both sides, there would not be found, he believed, a single person, whether churchman or Dissenter, who would not be extremely pleased if a measure could be framed which, without doing any injury to the church on the one hand, or violating the consciences of Dissenters on the other, might yet give the Dissenters relief from the grievances of which they complained. He was happy to say that His Majesty's Ministers

having turned their attention to this subject, were now enabled to propose a plan which, if it did not obviate every difficulty or meet every objection, would, he trusted, be found sufficient to give real and substantial relief in the case he had just alluded to.

The Dissenters, in calling for an alteration of the existing law, proposed one of two things—either that the act of marriage should be an entirely civil contract, with liberty to the parties afterwards to celebrate such religious ceremonies as were most agreeable to their feelings, or that power should be given to Dissenting ministers to celebrate marriages, and that such marriages should be held to be legal. With respect to the first of these propositions, he was ready to admit that it possessed a great advantage in its simplicity, and that it would at once obviate a great many of the difficulties with which this matter was incumbered. Yet, though it was in principle very defensible, it would be so repugnant to the feelings of a great portion of the country, that he did not think it would be wise or expedient to propose any measure of that sort. He then came to the second remedy proposed—namely, to allow Dissenting ministers to perform marriages on persons belonging to their own congregations; and it was on this principle that the bill which he had the honour to propose was founded. (Hear, hear.)

The Government did not intend to propose that every Dissenting chapel in the country should be licensed for the celebration of marriages; but whenever twenty householders in a parish should represent by memorial or petition that they wished to have a certain chapel in a fixed place licensed for that purpose, it should be incumbent on the magistrates at quarter sessions, or those by whom dissenting chapels were at present licensed for the celebration of divine worship, to grant the required license, on the condition that a notice of the grant of such license be fixed upon a conspicuous part of the chapel. The minister of that chapel would then have it in his power to celebrate marriages, but this power could only be exercised on certain conditions and in a specified manner. Parties wishing to be married according to ceremonies and rites differing from those of the church of England would have to proceed, in the first instance, in the same way as persons belonging to the establishment. They must either be married by bans or by license. If they choose to be married by bans, they would have to give a regular notice to the clergyman of the parish in which they reside; or if they resided in different parishes, to the clergyman of each, to publish the bans. After they had been published, if the parties wished the marriage to be celebrated by a dissenting minister, they must ask for a certificate of the due publication of the bans, and the clergyman of the parish, upon granting it, would enter in the book in which the bans were recorded that a certificate had been granted on the application of such parties. The dissenting minister would then give notice in his chapel that he would proceed on a certain day of the week to celebrate the marriage; and after the ceremony he would be required to record the marriage in a registry kept by him for that purpose.

He believed that insuperable difficulty would be felt in making the parish clergymen enter on the general registry marriages celebrated by Dissenting ministers, and therefore it was not to be denied, that in making the proposed alteration the advantage of possessing in the registry of the Church of England a registry of all the marriages celebrated in the country would be lost. Still this defect would be compensated for by providing that registries should be kept by the Dissenting ministers, a copy of which, at the completion of every three months, should be transmitted, accompanied by a fee, to the register of the diocese. He therefore thought that there would exist sufficient proofs of the celebration of these marriages. There would, first of all, be the record of the bans, and of the grant of the certificate; then the registers of the Dissenting chapels; and lastly, the copies kept by the register to the different dioceses. These Registries, it was well known, were at present very irregularly kept, but it was conceived that they would be preserved in a more regular and perfect manner if it was required that a fee should accompany their transmission to the registers of the dioceses.

There was, however, another difficulty with respect to this subject, to which he begged to call the attention of the house. It was well known that the registries of the established church were regularly kept in a fixed and certain place;

whereas Dissenting chapels were often abandoned by the religious frequenters and, being used for other purposes than divine worship, the registries kept in them ceased to be of any value. It would therefore be provided in the bill which he proposed to introduce, that the magistrates at quarter sessions, on being certified by two justices of the peace that any Dissenting chapel had ceased to be frequented, should have the power at once to put an end to the celebration of marriages in such chapel, and to order the original registry to be transmitted to the register of the diocese. Such an enactment as that would, he thought, provide against the difficulties which otherwise might be felt from the abandonment of a licensed chapel by its congregation. Another way in which marriages might be performed in this country was by license; and it would be enacted in the proposed measure, that Dissenters desiring to marry by license must make, as at present, application to the surrogate. The license having been granted, notice of that fact would be sent to the clergyman of the parish, and the Dissenting minister, on marrying the parties, would record the marriage in his registry.

Such were the chief provisions of the proposed measure, and he thought he need not say that no little difficulty had been found in drawing them up, so as to meet the wishes of all parties. But he was aware, that unless a disposition should be manifested to waive objections, and, to a certain degree, to give up scruples on this subject, both on the part of the Churchmen and Dissenters, no measure could be framed which would be satisfactory in its operation. He therefore trusted that concessions would be made on both sides, and that parliament would show that, while it was determined to preserve the just rights and privileges of churchmen, it had no objection, whenever any practical grievance was pointed out by the Dissenters, to inquire into the subject in the spirit of conciliation (Hear, hear.) The proposed bill would be equally applicable to Roman Catholics as to Protestant Dissenters, and in future, parties married in England by Roman Catholic priests would not have it in their power to separate either from caprice or interest. The noble lord concluded by moving for leave to bring in a bill "for the relief of persons dissenting from the church of England in regard to the celebration of marriages."

Mr. HUME thought the noble lord's proposition would complicate rather than simplify the existing law. He entirely disapproved of the principle acted upon in this country with regard to the celebration of marriages. It ought to be a mere civil act; and our registries, both of marriages and births, would be more complete if the insertion of names in them was not made dependent on the performance of certain religious ceremonies. He regretted that the noble lord, in framing his measure, had not followed the example of almost every country, and removed all cause of jealousy from the Dissenters, by making the act of marriage a civil contract. He was ready to admit that the proposed bill, though a partial measure, was some improvement on the existing law, and as he did not wish to oppose any improvements, he should not object to its introduction. At the same time he expressed a hope that a more comprehensive and liberal policy would, ere long, be acted on with regard to this subject.

Sir R. INGLIS thought the plan proposed by the noble lord so complicated, that it was impossible for the house at that moment, to express any opinion on it. The noble lord had pointed out with great precision the places at which the celebration of marriages was to be allowed under his bill, but he had not defined with equal clearness the parties by whom the marriages were to be celebrated; and he (Sir R. Inglis) was apprehensive—looking at the circumstances under which dissenting ministers were licensed, they being frequently appointed without any previous examination—that the same evils would be created by the proposed plan as existed in the country previous to the passing of the Marriage Act.

Dr. LUSHINGTON was not inclined to deny that, if in the existing state of society general principles could be carried into effect, consistently with the feelings respectively entertained by the different classes of which it was composed, it might perhaps be considered the most advisable, simple, and efficient plan to render marriage, after due publicity had been attained by some mode of publication, a civil ceremony, leaving it to the parties at a subsequent period to comply with such religious forms as their own feelings and consciences might dictate. (Hear,

hear.) But he did not require to tell the house, that they were not precisely in that condition at present, because among the people of the United Kingdom there existed a great variety of opinion both as to the forms of marriage and the nature of the contract, and he was perfectly confident it would be exceedingly difficult to carry into complete and universal effect the general principle adverted to without violating the conscientious opinions of a very large class of those who were attached to the Established Church. But if they could find a practical remedy for existing grievances—if they could remove from the minds of Dissenters the unpleasant and painful feelings which they at present experienced, without at the same time doing violence to the feelings of the Established Church, surely it would be expedient rather to depart from the strictness of theory, and adopt a middle course, which might prove acceptable to the great majority of all opinions.

SIR G. GREY expressed his regret, with the hon. member for Middlesex, that this country seemed so far behind all others in Europe with regard to registration. A large portion of the community, under the present system, were altogether excluded from its benefits; and it was quite necessary that a complete and extensive change should be introduced. (Hear, hear.) He hailed with satisfaction the measure of the noble (Russell), as the first step towards concessions to Dissenters of their just claims. (Cheers.) He said the first step, because he had no doubt the noble lord (Russell) agreed with him in thinking that they could not stop here. (Cheers.)

Mr. ESTCOURT was anxious at that early stage to guard himself against being understood as approving of all the provisions of the noble lord's bill; but if upon the most careful consideration he could give it his support, he should feel happy in doing so.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM said that he had listened to the speech of the noble lord who introduced the subject of the debate with that attention which its great interest demanded, and he thought the statements it contained so clear that no one could misapprehend them. Throughout the whole of that speech the aim of the noble lord was to show that His Majesty's Ministers were very desirous of affording relief to the Dissenters, and to prove that this measure would effectually secure the relief they desired. But after hearing the speech of the hon. and learned member for the Tower Hamlets (Dr. Lushington) he found that, though the measure was one professing to have for its main object the relief of the Dissenters, yet that a deference to the authority of the Church was still to be maintained, and great pains taken to prevent any thing being done that should displease the members of the Establishment. For his own part he confessed that he saw no sufficient reason for this tenderness towards the feelings of Churchmen, for since it was a Bill intended to regulate the Marriages of Dissenters, he could not understand why Churchmen should either assume, or be permitted to have, any interest whatever in the matter. The hon. and learned member for the Tower Hamlets had given it as the result of his experience, that the people of England belonging to the Established Church would be grievously wounded if the marriages of Dissenters were to be celebrated wholly by and among themselves, without the Church having any cognizance of the matter. Now, with all deference to the experience of the hon. and learned member, he (Mr. Buckingham) must take leave to say that, as far as his experience went—and it was as varied and extensive, perhaps, as that of the learned civilian—though possibly among different classes of society, he should say that he had never met with any lay members of the Church, who had not expressed their readiness to concede to the Dissenters the entire management of their marriages, burials, and all other ordinances of this description, without the interference of the Church in any way whatever. To the Clergy of the Establishment, who had a pecuniary interest in the preservation of the endowments which flowed from these ordinances, the entire transfer of their celebration to the Dissenters might perhaps be objectionable; but, as far as the general feeling of their congregations were engaged, he believed that few or no objections would be taken by them to such a transfer as fully and completely as the Dissenters themselves could desire.

The question had been raised as to whether marriage was generally regarded in this country as a civil contract, or a religious one; and undoubtedly it was

important to settle that point, in order to legislate on a sound basis for its future regulation. The reasons which induced him to think that even in England it was regarded much more in the light of a civil than a religious act was this. First, that though the solemnization of marriage is accompanied by a religious ceremony, all the obligations imposed by the contract are purely civil, and recognized only by the civil law. If there be at any time a breach of the promise to marry, a violation of the marriage vow after marriage has taken place, a desertion of the wife by the husband, an infidelity in either party, or any other departure from the duties of the married state, they are cognizable only by the civil law, they are prosecuted in courts of justice, and tried like other offences against the law, without any reference whatever to the peculiar creed of the parties. (Hear, hear.) Secondly, that in acts purely religious, the magistrate is never consulted or applied to; nor can any human authority be justly exercised either to allow or to prevent them. When, for instance, any individual, as a purely religious act, associates himself with some religious community, enters himself as a member of some particular sect, and joins with his religious brethren in all the duties which his union to them imposes, neither the civil magistrate nor the clerical authority are ever applied to, or their jurisdiction admitted in any way whatever. (Hear, hear.) It was clear then, from this, that marriage was not regarded as purely a religious act, either by the law or by the community; while its subjection to civil prosecutions and civil penalties for breaches of any part of its contracts, gave it a civil character in almost every stage, from its first contraction to its ultimate annulment by divorce. It would have been far better, then, he thought, since an alteration was to be made, had the whole subject been regarded as to its civil obligations; and these secured upon a firm and general basis; while the religious solemnization of the contract by different sects might have been left entirely to the direction of the several sects themselves. (Hear, hear.)

Among the provisions contained in the Bill, was one which still made it imperative upon the parties to have the banns of their marriage published in the parish church. Now he asked, what was the intention of the publication of banns at all? It was undoubtedly to prevent clandestine and improper marriages, by giving such ample notice of the intended union to the community at large, as to allow all who could state any objections to such union, to come forward and prevent it in time. But when Dissenters are about to be married, where could there be so proper a place for the publication of their banns, as in the chapel, and among the congregation to which they belonged? All their friends, connections, and associates would be there: and every thing respecting them be generally and accurately known; while in the parish church, which, being Dissenters, they would certainly not frequent, they would be as unknown as in another town, and the whole object of the publication of their banns be thus neutralized or defeated. Besides which, all those who were in the habit of hearing the banns published in the parish churches of large and populous districts, must be well aware, that the multiplicity of the names called over, was such as to become tiresome in the extreme, and lead to great inattention, while the divisions of the whole mass into the smaller portions which they would form, if the minister of each Dissenting chapel published the banns of all persons belonging to his congregation, would leave only a few names to be announced on each Sabbath, and these would obtain greater attention and greater publicity—in the very places where it was most important that that publicity should be given. (Hear, hear.)

There was one consideration, however, which presented itself to him with greater force than all the rest. The noble lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had objected, and most reasonably, to the introduction of so partial a measure as the bill proposed by the hon. and learned member for Dublin for the improvement of that Corporation only, while a great general measure was in preparation for improving other Corporations as well. Exactly the same objection, he thought, might be made to the present bill introduced by the noble lord, the Paymaster of the Forces. As a part of those measures of relief which the Dissenters sought, it was acceptable as far as it went; but it was deeply to be regretted that it should stop here. If it were really the wish of His Majesty's Government to afford relief to the Dissenters—and this was their professed object in introducing this measure—it would be well to ask, what were the points on

which the Dissenters asked such relief? (Hear, hear.) Did they confine themselves exclusively to the desire of being able to celebrate their own marriages in their own way? Certainly not. Whether we consulted the Memorials transmitted from the various bodies of Dissenters to Lord Grey, or the Petitions from them presented to this House, we saw that they all prayed for much more. First, for a general registration of births, instead of baptisms, to secure them that legal evidence on which the transmission of property, and various other rights, so materially depend; Secondly, for a general registration of marriages, unconnected entirely with any religious authority, and leaving the mode of solemnization open to all; Thirdly, for a power to inter their dead in parochial cemeteries, without the intervention of the Established Clergy, and by a funeral service of their own; and Fourthly, for an equal admission to, and participation in, all the honours of the Universities, without subscribing to religious tests, or being at all called upon to adhere to any particular opinions. (Hear, hear.)

If the noble lord or His Majesty's Ministers would introduce at once a bill, conferring on the Dissenters of England all these rights, he doubted not but that it would be hailed by the whole of that large portion of His Majesty's subjects with the greatest gratitude and joy; but the present measure he feared would be regarded as partial and insufficient; and since he was persuaded that before the close of the present Session, attempts would be made to secure for the Dissenters each and all of these objects of their desire, he ventured still to hope that His Majesty's Government would anticipate their wishes, by framing one general and comprehensive measure, which should embrace all these objects, and thus complete the great work of religious freedom, by emancipating all sects from any subjection or subordination to any dominant ecclesiastical power. (Hear, hear, hear.)

Mr. EWART approved of the measure as far as it went, but complained that it would not fully redress the great practical grievances under which Dissenters had so long laboured. He agreed generally with what had been said by the hon. member for Sheffield behind him, and the more he considered the matter the more strongly was he persuaded that nothing but a system of general registration, with a civil officer to superintend it would meet the justice of the case. He viewed marriage as a mere civil ceremony, having nothing at all to do with religion.

Mr. LYNCH supported the measure, and stated that the want of a general registration for the purpose of proving titles and establishing pedigrees was very much felt in Ireland.

Mr. FAITHFULL considered the measure proposed by the noble lord, as far as he understood it, too minute, and, if he might be allowed to use the expression, too contemptible to deserve the thankful acknowledgments of Dissenters. It had been represented as a great boon to them, and that they ought to receive it as such. On the other hand, he considered it an act of flagrant injustice. (Hear, hear.) The just rights of Dissenters had long been withheld from them; and this could not be considered as a restoration of all or of any one of their rights. He did not know how the measure would be received by the great body of Dissenters; he, however had a vast number of petitions to present on the subject of their claims, and he would, when the proper opportunity presented itself, express his opinions fully and openly. When the bill should be brought in, he promised the house to give it his best consideration, and to amend, if he possibly could, the objections which at present he felt against it.

After a short reply from Lord JOHN RUSSELL, who said that he should be ready to defend this bill and to obviate every objection which had as yet been brought against it, leave was given to bring in the bill.

LORD J. RUSSELL and DR. LUSHINGTON were ordered to bring it in.

•The remainder of the evening was occupied with a short conversation on a motion of Mr. Pryme, relative to Enclosure Bills, the terms of which motion, as well as the division on it, we have given in another page;—and a discussion on the case of the *Pilot* newspaper, of which we have spoken elsewhere. This last topic occupied the House from nine till one o'clock, and was, throughout, far more a gladiatorial ex-



hibition of the powers of mutual and reciprocal denunciation between Mr. Stanley and Mr. O'Connell, than was at all becoming such an inquiry. We give the following from the report as a short specimen.

Mr. STANLEY.—I agree with the hon. and learned gentleman opposite, the member for Drogheda, that Mr. Barrett is an ill-used man—he is an ill-used man, but by whom has he been ill-used? Not by the Government (cheers), but by those—

[Mr. O'CONNELL was here heard to say to those around him, "Let him alone."]

Mr. STANLEY (with great vehemence).—I presume that I am to be "let alone" in this house. (Immense cheers.)

Mr. O'CONNELL.—I rise to order. (Loud cries of "Order, order.")

Mr. STANLEY.—I say, Sir, that the disorderly interruption of the hon. and learned gentleman is not becoming the house in which that hon. and learned gentleman has the honour to sit. (Great cheering.) I say that when I am discharging my duty in the face of the house and the country, and when I am speaking before the hon. and learned gentleman and the country, as I trust I shall always speak, without fear or hesitation, before his face, I need not the permission of the hon. and learned gentleman, nor his audible exclamation that I should be "let alone," to obtain a hearing for any observations which I may consider it my duty to make. (Cheers.)

Mr. O'CONNELL.—I rise, Sir, to order. If I am out of order in what I am about to state, you, Sir, will at once correct me. I rise to explain the reason of the observation which the right hon. gentleman has attributed to me. It was addressed to two members near me. In consequence of both of them speaking to me at the same time, I was obliged to raise my voice to them to say "let him alone." (Hear, hear, from several Irish members, and ironical cheers from the rest of the house.) If I used any other expression, I call on the right hon. gentleman to state it. If I addressed any observation to him, I call on him to state what it was. My observation was solely intended as a private communication to two gentlemen near me, and from the cause I have mentioned, I was obliged to raise my voice in order to enable them to hear me.

Mr. STANLEY.—If the house is satisfied, I am sure I am. ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.)

The resolution first brought forward by Mr. O'Dwyer, was to the effect—That the exclusion of all Roman Catholics from the jury in the trial of Mr. Barrett, was calculated to affect the public confidence in the administration of justice in Ireland; and that it was desirable that in all future trials of a political nature, Protestants and Roman Catholics should be equally and indiscriminately associated in the juries. To which an amendment was moved by Mr. Feargus O'Connor, for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the facts of the case, both of which, however, were lost; the latter by a division of 132 against 26, and the original resolution was afterwards negatived without a division at all. We were in the House during all the early part of the evening: and waited until near twelve o'clock to give a vote in favour of the amendment for referring the matter to a Committee of Inquiry; but the long sitting and the unwholesome atmosphere after midnight, is so unfavourable even to persons in good health, and still more so to invalids, that the duty of self-preservation prescribes a limit, beyond which it is unsafe to go; and we should be glad to see that limit recognised by a rule of the House, that no division on any question should take place after midnight; for if sitting at late hours in Court to administer the laws be a crime,—and as such it is imputed to Baron Smith, sitting late hours in Parliament to enact laws is even more objectionable, and ought, on every consideration, to be put a stop to.

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

### LIST OF THE MAJORITY AGAINST INQUIRY INTO THE PENSION LIST.

Althorp, Viscount	Ellice, E.	Lushington, Dr.	Russell, W.
Anson, Hon. G.	Evans, W.	Lygon, Colonel	Russell, C.
Attwood, M.	Fitch, G.	Mangles, J.	Ryle, J.
Baring, F.	Fitzroy, Lord C.	Marjoribanks, S.	Sanderson, R.
Baring, H.	Foley, J. H. H.	Marsland, T.	Sandon, Lord
Barnett, C. J.	Forrester, Hon. W.	Maxfield, Captain	Scarlett, Sir J.
Bell, M.	Forster, C.	Mildmay, P. St. J.	Scott, Sir E.
Bentinck, Lord G.	Fox, Colonel	Milton, Viscount	Smith, J.
Bernal, R.	Gisborne, T.	Molyneux, Lord	Smith, R.
Blackstone, W. S.	Gladstone, W. E.	Morpeth, Lord	Somerset, Lord G.
Bolling, W.	Gordon, R.	Mostyn, Hon. E. M.	Spunkie, Serjeant
Bouverie, Hon. D. P.	Graham, Sir J.	Nicholl, J.	Stanley, Rt. Hon. E.
Brougham, W.	Grant, Right Hon. R.	Norreys, Lord	Stanley, Hon. T.
Bruce, Lord E.	Grey, Colonel	North, F.	Staunton, Sir G. H.
Buller, J. W.	Grey, Sir G.	Old, W. H.	Stewart, P.
Buller, E.	Gronow, Captain	Ossulston, Lord	Stuart, Lord D.
Bulzeel, J.	Halford, H.	Penleaze, J.	Tayleur, W.
Burdett, Sir F.	Hanmer, Sir J.	Paget, F.	Thompson, P. B.
Buxton, T. F.	Herbert, Hon. S.	Palmer R.	Thomson, Hon. C. P.
Byng, G.	Hardinge, Sir H.	Palmerston, Lord	Throckmorton, R. G.
Byng, Sir J.	Harland, W. C.	Pechell, Sir S.	Tower, C. T.
Carter, J. B.	Herbert, Hon. S.	Peel, Rt Hon. Sir R.	Townley, R. G.
Cartwright, W.	Heron, Sir R.	Peel, Col.	Tracy, C. H.
Cavendish, Hon. C.	Herries, Rt. Hon. J.	Pendarves, E. W.	Trevor, Hon. G. R.
Cavendish, Lord	Hodgson, J.	Peter, W.	Vernoy, Sir H.
Cavendish, Hon. H. F.	Howick, Lord	Phillpotts, J.	Vernon, Hon. G. S.
Childers, J. W.	Hope, H.	Pigot, R.	Vivyan, Sir R.
Clive, F. B.	Inglis, Sir R.	Pinnay, W.	Willoughby, Sir H.
Clive, Hon. R. H.	Irton, S.	Ponsonby, Hon. W.	Winnington, Sir T.
Crawley, S.	Johnstone, Sir J.	Pryme, G.	Wood, G.
Cripps, J.	Keppell, Major G.	Reid, Sir J.	Walker, R.
Darlington, Earl of	Kerrison, Sir E.	Rice, Hon. T. S.	Ward, H.
Davenport, J.	Knatchbull, Sir E.	Ridley, Sir M.	Warre, J.
Denison, J. E.	Labouchere, H.	Robarts, A. W.	Waterpark, Lord
Donkin, Sir R.	Lambton, H.	Rolfe, R.	Wedgwood, J.
Duffield, T.	Lemon, Sir C.	Rooper, J. B.	Weyland, Major R.
Dundas, Hon. Sir R.	Lincoln, Earl of	Ross, C.	Whitbread, W.
Ebrington, Lord	Littleton, E.	Russell, Hon. Lord J.	Wrottesley, Sir J.
Egerton, W.	Lumley, Viscount	Russell, Lord C.	

### SCOTLAND.

Adam, Admiral	Dalmeny, Lord	Grant, Rt. Hon. C.	Johnstone, J.
Agnew, Sir A.	Elliot, Hon. Captain	Halliburton, Hon. D.	Loch, J.
Arbuthnot, General	Fergusson, Captain	Hay, Colonel	M'Kennie, J. A. S.
Bruce, C.	Fleming, Admiral	Jeffrey, Rt. Hon. F.	M'Leod, R.
		Murray, J. A.	

### IRELAND.

Browne, J. D.	Corry, Hon. H.	Hill, Lord M.	Talbot, J.
Browne, D.	Fitzgibbon, Hon. R.	Jones, Captain	Verner, Colonel
Castlereagh, Viscount	Gladstone, T.	Knox, Hon. Col. J.	Wallace, T.
Christmas, J.	Hayes, Sir E.	Shaw, F.	Young, J.

TELLERS.—Duncannon, Viscount.—Wood, C.

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 204.

Tellers included, who, on the 21st of February, 1834, voted for the Motion of the Marquis of Chandos,—That, in all future Reductions of Taxation, due regard should be paid to the Relief of the Agricultural Interests.

Aglionby, H.	Foley, E.	Miller, W. H.	Sullivan, R.
Arbuthnot, General	Folkes, Sir W.	Manners, Lord R.	Sinclair, G.
Attwood, M.	Forrester, Hon. C.	Miles, W.	Sheil, R. L.
Attwood, T.	Fremantle, Sir T.	Maxwell, H.	Scott, J. W.
Bankes, W. J.	Fryer, R.	Maxwell, J.	Shawe, R. N.
Barnard, E. G.	Gladstone, T.	Macnamara, F.	Surrey, Earl of
Barron, H. W.	Gladstone, W. E.	Moreton, Hon. A.	Talbot, C. R. M.
Bethell, R.	Grattan, H.	Neeld, J.	Tynte, C. J. K., jun.
Blake, M.	Greene, T.	Neale, Sir H.	Throckmorton, R.
Blandford, Marquis	Gordon, Hon. Capt.	Newark, Viscount	Talbot, J. H.
Blackstone, W. S.	Goring, H. D.	Nicholl, J.	Thompson, P. B.
Barry, G. S.	Goulbourn, Hon. H.	Norreys, Lord	Tower, C. J.
Baring, A.	Grimston, Viscount	Ossulston, Lord	Talbot, J. H.
Baring, H. B.	Gully, John	O'Connell, D.	Trevor, Hon. G. R.
Bell, M.	Grant, Hon. Col.	O'Connell, M.	Tennyson, Rth Hon. C.
Benett, J.	Halcomb, J.	O'Connell, J.	Tennent, J. E.
Bruce, Lord E.	Halford, H.	O'Connor, Don	Townley, R. G.
Bruce, C. C.	Hall, B.	O'Connor, F.	Tyrell, Sir J.
Butler, Hon. Col.	Handley, H.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Trelawney, W. S.
Burrell, Sir C.	Handley, W. F.	Oswald, R. A.	Tullamore, Lord
Castlereagh, Visc.	Handley, B.	Parker, Sir H.	Townshend, Lord C.
Cartwright, W. R.	Hammer, Sir J.	Parrott, J.	Talbot, J.
Chayley, E. S.	Haumer, Colonel	Palmer, C. F.	Turner, W.
Chapman, A.	Harcourt, G. V.	Palmer, R.	Verner, Col.
Clive, Hon. R.	Hardinge, Sir H.	Pease, J.	Vigors, N. A.
Cobbett, W.	Harvey, D. W.	Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir R.	Verney, Sir H.
Cole, Viscount	Hayes, Sir E.	Peel, J.	Villiers, Viscount
Conolly, Col.	Henniker, Lord	Pollock, F.	Vincent, Sir F.
Cookes, T. H.	Herbert, Hon. S.	Poulter, J. S.	Wilks, J.
Corry, Hon. H. L.	Herries, Rt. Hon. J.	Plumtre, J. P.	Wilmington, Sir T.
Curteis, Captain	Hodges, T. L.	Pigott, R.	Wilmington, H. J.
Dashwood, G. H.	Hodgson, J.	Ryder, T.	Wason, R.
Daly, J.	Hoskins, R.	Rippon, C.	Wood, Col.
Dare, R. H.	Hotham, Lord	Ruthven, E.	Williams, R.
Darlington, Earl of	Houldsworth, T.	Ruthven, E. S.	Willoughby, Sir H.
Dawson, E.	Inghs, Sir R.	Roche, W.	Windham, W. H.
Dillwyn, L.	Iton, S.	Roche, D.	Weyland, R.
Duffield, T.	Jermyn, Earl	Rooper, J. B.	Wall, C. B.
Duncombe, Hon. W.	Jones, Captain	Russell, C.	Whitmore, T. C.
Dugdale, W. S.	Kerrison, Sir E.	Richards, J.	Williams, Col.
Eastnor, Viscount	Kennedy, J.	Rickford, W.	Wallace, T.
Egerton, W. T.	Lewis, Hon. T. F.	Ross, C.	Wilmot, Sir G.
Estcourt, T. G. B.	Locke, W.	Stewart, J.	Watkins, J. V.
Faucourt, Major	Lennard, Sir T. B.	Simeon, Sir R.	Williams, T. P.
Fergusson, R. C.	Lincoln, Earl of	Stanley, E.	Walker, C. A.
Fielden, J.	Lygon, Hon. Col.	Shaw, F.	Wallace, R.
Feilden, W.	Loder, P.	Scott, Sir E. D.	Williams, W.
Finch, George	Leech, J.	Sanderson, R.	Yorke, Captain
Finn, W.	Langton, Colonel G.	Somerset, Lord G.	Young, G. F.
Fitzsimon, C.	Milton, Viscount	Spry, S.	Young, J.

Tellers.—Chandos, Marquis of—Knatchbull, Sir E.

## PAIRED OFF.

Denison, W. J.

Ferguson, Captain

Tynte, Colonel

## LIST OF THE MAJORITY OF 163,

Tellers included, who, on the 21st February, 1834, voted for Sir Edward Knatchbull's motion That the Order for a Committee to inquire into the conduct of Baron Smith, should be discharged.

Arbuthnot, Hon. G.	Daly, J.	Halcomb, John	Ross, Charles
Agnew, Sir A.	Evans, G.	Johnston, Andrew	Ridley, Sir M.
Acheson, Viscount	Ewing, J.	Jernyn, Earl of	Rumbold, C. E.
Anson, Hon. G.	Eastnor, Viscount	Irton, Samuel	Read, Sir J. R.
Baring, H.	Estcourt, T. G. B.	Inglis, Sir R. H.	Rice, Hon. T. S.
Baring, A.	Egerton, W. T.	Jones, T.	Rickford, William
Bell, M.	Ferguson, Sir R.	Kerrison, Sir Edward	Scott, Sir E. D.
Bentinck, Lord G.	Ferguson, Captain	Kerry, Earl of	Sandon, Viscount
Blaney, Hon. C.	Fremantle, Sir T. F.	King, B.	Sanderson, R.
Burrell, Sir C.	Fuch, G.	Knox, Hon. Col.	Stewart, John
Bainbridge, E. T.	Forrester, Hon. C.	Lyall, G.	Scarlett, Sir James
Baulhe, J. E.	Forster, C.	Lloyd, T. H.	Stewart, P. M.
Brougham, W.	Feilden, W.	Lygon, Colonel	Stanley, Edward
Bruce, Lord E.	Fitzroy, Lord C.	Lennox, Lord A.	Staunton, Sir G.
Bruce, C. L. C.	Frankland, Sir R.	Lincoln, Earl of	Skipwith, Sir G.
Buller, J. W.	Fancourt, Major	Marryat, J.	Somerset, Lord G.
Banks, W. J.	Goulburn, Rt. Hon. H.	Macnamara, F.	Spankie, Sergeant
Bethell, R.	Grimston, Viscount	Miles, W.	Tyrell, Sir John T.
Blandford, Marquis	Greene, T.	Morpeth, Viscount	Tyrell, Charles
Browne, D.	Gladstone, T.	Manners, Lord R.	Tennent, J. E.
Blackstone, W. J.	Glynne, Sir S.	Maxwell, Henry	Talbot, H. Fox
Barnard, E. G.	Graham, Sir J.	Norreys, Lord	Trevor, Hon. G. R.
Browne, D.	Gladstone, W. E.	Nicholl, John	Townshend, Lord C.
Chandos, Marquis of	Hodgson, John	Neeld, Joseph	Talbot, James
Chapman, A.	Hanmer, Colonel	Neele, Sir H. B.	Tullamore, Lord
Curtis, Capt.	Hanmer, Sir John	Ossulston, Lord	Vernon, G. H.
Clive, Hon. R.	Hope, H. T.	Ormelie, Earl of	Vernon, Hon. G. V.
Castlereagh, Visc.	Herbert, Hon. S.	Palmer, C. Fyacha	Vivyan, Sir R. R.
Cole, Viscount	Hotham, Lord	Palmer, Robert	Verney, Sir H.
Conolly, Colonel	Handley, Henry	Pinney, William	Villiers, Viscount
Corry, Hon. H.	Hardy, J.	Pigot, R.	Verner, Colonel
Chaytor, Sir W.	Halford, H.	Pollock, Frederick	Williams, T. P.
Cavendish, Lord	Harcourt, G. V.	Pease, Joseph	Willoughby, Sir H.
Denison, W. J.	Hughes, W. Hughes	Parker, Sir Hyde	Waterpark, Lord
Denison, E. J.	Houldsworth, T.	Plumptre, J. P.	Whitmore, T. C.
Dugdale, W. S.	Handley, W. F.	Philips, Sir G.	Wall, C. B.
Dare, R. H.	Hardinge, Sir H.	Peel, Hon. Sir R.	Wood, G. W.
Dykes, F. L. B.	Hayes, Sir E.	Russell, Charles	Young, G. F.
Duffield, T.	Herries, Hon. J. C.	Ryle, John	Young, J.
Darlington, Earl of	Howard, Hon. Capt.	Robinson, G. R.	Yorke, Captain

TELLERS.—Knatchbull, Sir E.—Shaw, Frederick.

## PAIRED OFF.

Attwood, M.	Gordon, Hon. Capt.	Lewis, Rt. Hon. T. F.	Sharpe, General
Cartwright, W. R.	Henniker, Lord	Miller, W. H.	Sinclair, G.
Duncombe, Hon. W.	Humphery, John	Newark, Viscount	Wood, Colonel
Foley, Edward	Jolliffe, Colonel	North, F.	Wrottesley, Sir J.
Grant, Hon. F.	Lennox, Lord W.	Peel, Lieut.-Colonel	

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 32,

Tellers included, who, on the 25th February, voted for the Appointment of a Select Committee, to inquire into the manner in which the Jury was appointed to try the cause of the "King v. Barrett," for publishing the Letter of Mr O'Connell, in the *Pilot* newspaper.

Aglionby, H. A.	Fitzgerald, T.	O'Connell, M.	Roche, W.
Attwood, T.	Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connell, J.	Roche, D.
Barron, H. W.	Hume, J.	O'Connor, F.	Ruthven, E.
Barry, G. S.	Kennedy, J.	O'Dwyer, C. A.	Ruthven, E. S.
Bellew, R. M.	Lalor, P.	O'Ferrall, R. M.	Sheil, R. L.
Blake, M. J.	Lynch, A. H.	Potter, R.	Talbot, J. H.
Faithfull, G.	O'Connell, D.	Roe, J.	Vigers, N. A.
Finn, W.	O'Connell, M.	Roebuck, J. A.	Walker, L. R.

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 33,

Tellers included, who, on the 25th February, voted for Mr. Pryme's Motion, That the Committee on every Inclosure Bill shall, in their Report, certify whether a portion of land, as near to the village as conveniently may be, and not less than in the proportion of one acre to every twenty-five inhabitants according to the last Population Census, has been by such Bill directed to be allotted out of the commonable lands or waste grounds to the incumbent of the living and the parish officers for the time being, and the owners of one hundred acres of land in such parish as trustees, in trust to let the same in small portions, at low rents, to all labourers resident in the parish who may be desirous of hiring the same, such rents to be paid to the parish officers for the time being, in aid of the poor-rates; or whether there be any special reason why such allotment cannot conveniently or properly be made in that particular instance.

Beauclerk, Major	Buxton, T. F.	Marsland, T.	Ruthven, E. S.
Blake, M.	Dundas, Capt.	Maxwell, J.	Sinclair, G.
Briggs, R.	Faithfull, G.	Miles, W.	Staveley, T. K.
Briscoe, J.	Fielden, J.	O'Connor, F.	Tollemache, A. G.
Brocklehurst, J.	Grosvenor, Lord R.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Tyrell, C.
Brodie, W. B.	Hall, B.	Pease, J.	Walter, J.
Brotherton, J.	Kennedy, J.	Roebuck, J. A.	Williams, Col.
Buckingham, J. S.	Lalor, P.	Ruthven, E.	

TELLERS.—Pryme, G.—Potter, R.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Our Correspondent at Birmingham, who wishes us to give a list of Petitions presented to the House—by whom, and for what purpose—is informed that to do this fully, (and without it were complete, it would be useless to attempt it) would require a very large addition to our space. During the last Session, when the Number was sold at a Shilling, it was begun, but obliged to be given up before the Session was over, from the vast accumulation of arrears. Now that the Review is reduced to Sixpence, purposely to bring it within the reach of those from whom its price kept it before, it is still more indispensable to select only the most important of the topics discussed in Parliament, and to give only the pith and essence of these.

THE

## PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1834.

### SKETCH OF RICHARD LALOR SHEIL, ESQ., MEMBER FOR THE COUNTY TIPPERARY.

THE public life of such a man as Mr. Sheil must at all times be a topic of public interest ; but at no period could such a Sketch as that which we have now the pleasure to present our readers, be more acceptable than now, when he has just received the full and honourable acquittal of those, to whose investigation the recent charges against his reputation were intrusted.

Mr. Sheil was born near Waterford, we believe, in the year 1790. He is consequently now in his 43d year. His father had been a man of considerable wealth, as a merchant, but in consequence of severe losses, we have heard he retired from trade with a small independence. We know little of the juvenile years of Mr. Sheil ; at an early age he was sent to the Jesuit's College, of Stonyhurst, near Preston, in Lancashire. There is no better school in which to acquire proficiency if not solidity in classical learning. The Jesuits have long been celebrated as men of correct and elegant taste. As annotators too, they have acquired considerable fame ; nor are they without their praise as historians. Mariana's " History of Spain," looking to the period of its composition, may be pronounced, at least in the graces of style, to be much in advance of the epoch in which it was composed ; and the Histories of Father Charlevoix, and of the Père Bougeant, will be referred to, so long as either the " Country of Paraguay" or the " Treaty of Westphalia" shall excite an European interest. Let us not be understood as undervaluing the scientific acquirements of the disciples of Loyola. Their order produced one of the earliest commentators on Newton ; and though they cannot aspire to the praise of such profound scientific attainments as the Benedictines, nor produce such a work as the glory of St. Maur, we mean, "*L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*,"—still they follow next in succession, it must be admitted, "*And passibus equis*," that celebrated and highly gifted order. As men and Christians, as scholars and gentlemen, we decidedly give preference to the Benedictines, but both of them may be considered as the literary soldiers of the Roman Church.

The Jesuits, however, are not so much distinguished, for being learned themselves, as for having been from the earliest times the

causes of learning in others. The profound and various Bayle received at their hands the first rudiments of classical learning; they were the earliest preceptors of the young and sarcastic Aronet, who acquired an imperishable renown under the name of Voltaire. They were the instructors of the ingenious and reasoning Pascal, and of one of the most elegant of modern Latin poets, who was, himself, we believe, of the order—we mean the Polish Count, Casimir Sarbievius.

Though Mr. Sheil cannot claim any kindred with three of these high names, yet he has, in Ireland, played no unimportant part as a politician, and as a dramatist he is known to the English public as the author of "The Apostate," "Evadne," "Adelaide," &c. Some of the credit of his fame we are willing to allow in a great part to his earliest instructors, and perhaps it might with some show of reason be contended that they exercised no ordinary influence on his future destinies. While among the learned fathers of Lancashire, Mr. Sheil was distinguished for aptness, industry, and a quick and brilliant fancy. He acquired during this season considerable proficiency in classical learning, and left the school with the reputation of being a clever and brilliant boy.

From Stonyhurst Mr. Sheil, at an early age, went to Trinity College, Dublin. We do not believe that the hon. and learned member for Tipperary was peculiarly distinguished at the University, though he exhibited a predilection for classical learning, and wooed the Muses with some success.

At this period, 1810-11, he became a member of the Historical Society. This was a debating club, composed of students of a certain standing. It had been of ancient date, and numbered among its members some of the most able and brilliant men that Ireland had produced. At the University, Burgh, Dugueny, Grattan, Curran, Ponsouby, Brownlow, Yelverton, and Bushe had been its most distinguished members. And at the period of the passing of the Union, Moore, and the younger Emmet—whose tragical end forms one of the most interesting, though melancholy episodes in the page of Irish history—were among its most constant attendants. At a subsequent period Messrs. North and Dogherty (both afterwards members of the Imperial Parliament) distinguished themselves at this society, and at a still later epoch Mr. Sheil was sometimes heard within its walls. Very shortly after, the Historical Society fell under the displeasure of the Provost, Dr. Elrington. The members continued to discuss, after repeated warnings, questions of a political tendency; and the result was, that Elrington, who was afterwards promoted to the see of Ferns, and who, we believe, still holds that preferment, suppressed this juvenile club.

The adoption of such a course would appear somewhat extraordinary in England; but they manage these things very differently in Ireland. Here, at Oxford, and at Cambridge, as well as at debating societies connected with the Inns of Court, men, not older in years than the ex-members of the Historical Society, discuss all sorts of political questions. But it must be confessed, the Englishman is of cooler head, and less fervid temperament, than the academic youth of Ireland.

We remember to have heard, that some years ago a Society met in Dublin, for the prevention of Duelling. The object was certainly praiseworthy, and one would have thought that the men who

set about such a task would have been emphatically men of peace. The Society consisted only of fifteen individuals, but even amongst so small a number of men, united for a common object, there were great and fundamental differences of opinion. Matters waxed warm—words became high—gestures grew vehement—blows were even about to be exchanged—when cards were demanded, and the day after this notable meeting, eight of the Society of fifteen were found to be engaged in duels, four as principals, the other four as seconds! When, therefore, men engaged in a work of charity and peace get entangled, and set together by the ears, what must have been the consequences in a Society composed of very young and very excitable men, discussing with zeal the furious politics of Ireland? In a time of public repose it must have led to frequent private squabbles; while in a season of public commotion, the effect must have been infinitely more dangerous. We are not, therefore, prepared to condemn Dr. Elrington, without hearing the arguments he had to urge in favour of the suppression of the University Debating Club.

During the period of Mr. Sheil's probation at College, the Catholic Board was in great vogue. The Board was the germ of what the Association afterwards became. It certainly was more aristocratic, and was composed of a more numerous body of Catholic gentlemen than the Association; but it never exercised the influence which was within the power of the Association to sway. It was at the Board that Mr. O'Connell acquired his ascendancy, and it was on the same theatre that Mr. Sheil made his first public *début*. His maiden speech was pronounced by his Irish admirers to be a complete and successful display. There is, certainly, no accounting for opinions in these affairs; but to us, reading the speech at this distance of time, and in a different country, it does not appear to be conceived in the best possible taste. That it produced great effect on an Irish auditory we can readily conceive, for there is a proneness in the Irish to be pleased with strange transpositions of words, and collocations of phrase, which would never occur to a people who spoke the English as a native tongue. They are, moreover, greatly enamoured with those theatrical pauses and intonations, or to use a phrase of the subject of this Sketch, with those "rhetorical artifices" in which Mr. Sheil is so great an adept.

Till the period of his embarkation for England, to enter himself of the Temple, Mr. Sheil continued an exhibitant before his countrymen. He was rewarded with a great deal of hyperbolical praise, and on one occasion had the great good fortune to receive the fraternal embrace, *à la Française* from the capacious arms of Mr. O'Connell. Mr. Sheil had, it appeared, outdone himself, in an effort of "super-human oratory," and subdued even the heart of the great Pacificator, who, rising from his chair, clasped the young orator to his breast, and exclaimed, "Yes, my friend, we must, we shall be emancipated!" Whether the "prophetic soul" of the future Agitator broke forth in this apostrophe, we profess not to know; but certain it is, that in seventeen years afterwards, the vaticinations of the speaker came to pass, as he had himself predicted.

Mr. Sheil arrived in London about the beginning of the year 1812, freighted with a tragedy, called, "Adelaide, or the Emigrants," which had already been performed with very considerable applause at the



Dublin theatre, and a large portion of very inflammable Irish discontent. While at the Temple, the Member for Tipperary was a constant attendant at a Society called "The Eccentrics," whose meetings were then held in May's Buildings, St. Martin's Lane. Of this Society, Mr. Canning, when a Templar, and many other eminent men, had been also members; but at this early period it was in its lust and prime. At the time of Mr. Sheil's admission, it was certainly in progress towards decay, and afterwards became the resort of a nest of senseless word-mongers, of loose habits and unsettled opinions. Under proper management, however, such a Society afforded great facilities for acquiring flow of speech and a knowledge of the art of sifting human testimony, for it was the customary course of debate for one member to make a charge against another, almost always of the most frivolous description, and to attempt to sustain it by evidence. It was in the power of the member charged, to cross-examine the witnesses, and address the Society in his own behalf. This course gave scope to the exercise of all those faculties which come into play in Jury questions. Mr. Sheil's efforts at "The Eccentrics" and "The Academics" were characterized by fervid highflown language, and theatrical gesture, but withal there was apparent a logical subtilty and arrangement not usually found, even in the premeditated efforts of the young Irish students of that day.

In the latter end of 1813, or the beginning of 1814, Mr. Sheil returned to Ireland, and shortly after was called to the Irish Bar. Again the Member for Tipperary renewed his attendance at the Catholic Board, and delivered himself of a number of set discourses, characterized by diction infinitely more brilliant and antithetical than natural or pure. These speeches were usually made in opposition to the projects of Mr. O'Connell, who had, on all occasions, the good fortune to obtain a large majority to sanction his measures. The great Agitator wielded at will not alone the fierce democracy of Ireland, but the enthusiastic and united priesthood; while his eloquent but more timid and moderate opponent, was supported by a class of men then called Aristocrats and Vetoists. On the disputes of the rival orators it is not necessary here to dwell. At any season they would possess little interest for our readers; and now that Catholic Emancipation has passed they are utterly valueless—mere hair-splittings *de lanu caprina*. But the event has proved (even if Mr. Sheil's defection from the ranks of his old friends and junction with O'Connell did not evince his conviction on the subject) that the bolder, and manlier, and more agitating course, could alone have obtained success. The true history of the secret causes of the repeal of the Penal Laws remains to be written. No doubt the Duke of Wellington was greatly influenced by mixed motives in carrying Emancipation. The intrigues of Polignac with the *Parti Pretre* in Ireland and in Belgium were known to him. He was well aware of the feelings and opinions of a great body of the soldiery serving in Ireland. He knew that on one occasion they had given three cheers for O'Connell, and that in the event of a civil war they would not have acted against their co-religionists. The foreign policy of England was in an unsettled state. The questions of Turkey and Greece were open and unarranged. These were considerations which greatly influenced the mind of the Premier, and to such considerations he yielded rather than to a sense of high principle and justice.

For eight years did Mr. Sheil ineffectually struggle against Mr. O'Connell; but at the end of the year 1822 he had made no further progress than at his outset in 1814. During this long apprenticeship to agitation, Mr. Sheil had become a married man, and the father of a family, but he had meantime made no progress in his profession, though in the interval he had composed two or three tragedies, which were acted with considerable success. There were not wanting men of all parties who averred that the Government ought to have done something for Mr. Sheil; and indeed at this period rumours were rife of his appointment as a Commissioner of Bankrupts; but the appointment never was made, and in the beginning of 1823 it was pretty generally understood that preliminaries of peace had been agreed on between the high contending parties, and shortly after a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, was signed and ratifications exchanged in due form between O'Connell and Sheil.

Contemporaneously with these proceedings the Catholic Association started into existence, and a brilliant campaign seemed to be on the eve of opening. Never was the truth of the adage, *L'union fait la force*, more fully proved than on this occasion. The junction of O'Connell and Sheil produced universal harmony, and excited a new interest. The meetings of the Catholic Board had from the very opposition of these twin stars become "weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable;" while their union formed a constellation as brilliant as attractive. In a word, numbers flocked to the rooms of the Corn Exchange, who had never made their appearance there before. The Rent was instituted—simultaneous meetings were held—money flowed in to the hitherto bankrupt treasury; and the politician need not be told that "money is strength." For a year and a half nothing could be more prosperous than the united counsels of the heretofore antagonist powers. Mr. Sheil made several set speeches, abounding with striking and felicitous allusions, but we must fairly add, disfigured by that *cacoethes* for antithesis and alliteration, which so much mar the effect of his written as well as his spoken discourses. The effect produced by these speeches was to raise their author from an ill-disguised unpopularity to a fame and favour second only to that of Mr. O'Connell. Business at the bar now flowed in on him freely, and though his previous inexperience disqualified him from doing many of his clients full justice, yet such was the fervour of party, and the partiality of friendship, that his clients were not only contented with his advocacy, but warm in his praise.

At length the Deputation to England was resolved on, late in January 1825, and early in the ensuing month the members composing it set sail from Dublin for Holyhead. It is not our business to write the history of that Deputation. We have neither the facts nor the knowledge to enable us to do so; but we may here repeat that they were five-and-twenty very simple gentlemen; and that though one of them was a man in large business at the bar, and therefore it may be presumed with a very competent knowledge of human life, that nevertheless he and they were one and all grossly imposed on by the Ministry of that day. This is not meant as a reproach to the five-and-twenty delegates. For the most part they were quiet and unobtrusive men in the private relations of social existence, with no personal know-

ledge of the political characters of England, and as little insight into the chicane and by-ways of a court. It is no marvel that such ambassadors should be outwitted by the practised and profligate minions of men in office.

While in England, in 1825, Mr. Sheil was examined before a Committee of the House of Commons, on the state of Ireland. His testimony was remarkable, as the solitary instance in which a witness dealt rather in tropes and metaphors than in facts. He also addressed public meetings on three or four occasions, but with no great effect. In truth the speeches both of Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Sheil were both too theatrical and redundant in gesture, and too Gallic in sentiment, to take with a British audience.

The Deputation returned to Ireland loaded with unpopularity. They had consented (though not unahimously, nor without strong protests to the contrary) to the introduction of a Bill accompanied with what were called "wings," and which was subsequently lost. It was a considerable time before either O'Connell or Sheil recovered the obloquy (whether justly or unjustly attached to them we shall not now pronounce) with which they were covered. At length, however, in consequence of strenuous present exertions, the past was forgiven and forgotten. Sheil continued to harangue copiously, and to obtain business in moderation, until a prosecution of the Attorney-General, Plunkett, hermetically sealed his lips, and gave him, perhaps, the worst client in the world as an employer—we mean his very self. There is, as the poet says, "some soul of goodness in things evil," and this *brutum fulmen* of a prosecution, which exploded in the hands of the Attorney-General, became the very *Ægis* of the fortunate defendant. Persecution is, indeed, the seed of popularity. It is as efficacious to the deification of the victim, as the blood of the martyr was to the canonization of the saint. Hence Mr. Sheil became more than ever popular; and was, perhaps, at the acme of his fame just before the passing of the Relief Bill. When this bill had become the law of the land, Mr. Sheil (who had shortly before made a visit to Penenden Heath to deliver a speech, in reply to Lord Winchelsea, which, by a singular mischance was printed in the newspapers in London before it was spoken in Kent), again touched the English shores as member for Milbourne Port, in the county of Somerset. He had been returned for this borough by the interest of the Marquis of Anglesea, then Viceroy of Ireland. A dissolution took place shortly afterwards, and he came in, if we mistake not, for the county of Louth.

During the period he sat for Milbourne Port, his popularity underwent a slight revulsion; but it again rose above par in consequence of his popular declamation in the county of Louth. As a county member, Mr. Sheil spoke not infrequently in St. Stephen's. His addresses were not prolix, but glowing in the language and impassioned in the manner. Their chief defects were an apparent bitterness (we say apparent, for no man is of kindlier or more benignant nature than Mr. Sheil), a strange, and we think infelicitous and unnatural inversion of phrase—a too great redundancy of action and a swinging to and fro, and ducking as it were of the body, which had a singularly ungraceful effect. It were unjust at the same time to deny that many of his thoughts were striking, that his arguments were logical, and neatly

put, and the division of his subject orderly and luminous. There was, it is true, no great depth of information—none of that general historical research which distinguished the efforts of Mr. Macauley, but the knowledge with which he served himself lay on the surface of the subject, and he had used it not only to good purpose, but correctly and ingeniously.

After the passing of the Reform Bill, Mr. Sheil presented himself to the inhabitants of the county of Tipperary. He had ~~not~~ an opponent the present Lord Hutchinson, some of whose family had represented that county for nearly half a century; and who, it may be said, had paramount claims from this long-standing connexion, and from general liberality of sentiment, as well as from the possession of considerable property within the limits of the county. Mr. Sheil had just before acquired some property in the county, by his second marriage with a wealthy widow lady, but it was not this adventitious circumstance, but his sentiments on the Repeal Question, which secured him the good opinion of the Electors. A year previously he had not made up his mind on this Question of Repeal, but now, seeing that the popular current had set in strongly and rapidly in its favour, and conscientiously, no doubt, approving its direction, he allowed himself to be carried with the stream.

Since the commencement of the first session of the Reformed Parliament in 1833, Mr. Sheil's efforts are so well known, and so fresh in the memory of our readers, that we need do scarcely more than refer to them. His first effort on Wednesday, February 6th, in the last session, was in reply to Mr. Macauley, who, on the Question of the Address, had delivered himself of a speech against the Repeal of the Union. The hon. Member replied very happily to the late Member for Leeds, and produced a strong impression by reading from a speech of Lord Grey's, in which the noble Lord predicted, "that if the Union were persisted in, the Irish would only wait an opportunity of recovering their rights, which they would say were taken from them by force." His next effort, and it was a superior one in point of effect, was on the Irish Coercion Bill; but the speech which pleased us most, was that on the Irish Church Temporalities Bill, delivered in April last. In this speech are to be found passages of a high and noble diction, flowing in natural order, not debased by the alloy of indifferent antitheses or the jangling of empty and sounding phrases. This effort, really eloquent, and full of apt historic reference, shows what Mr. Sheil could do if he would strain less after effect either in diction or manner. It is thought, however, by those best acquainted with Mr. Sheil's powers, that he appears to the greatest advantage when addressing a *Nisi Prius* Jury, and that as an advocate before such a tribunal he stands high above all his countrymen, and without a rival.

The last great speech of Mr. Sheil was on the third reading of the Irish Church Bill. Towards the close of the session he appears to have been convinced that the contortions of the Sibyl were of no effect without the inspiration, for he began now to adopt a plainer and less ambitious phrase. Some of the passages in this his last speech are worthy of the best age of eloquence, even in his own eloquent country, particularly that in which he calls on the Ministry to try a policy of gentleness and kindness instead of harshness and coercion. Mr.

Sheil's idea is so exactly that of the Italian poet, that we cannot but think he had the lines in view :

Meglio con la man dolce si raffrena  
Che con forza il cavallo ; e le fusinghe  
Meglio i cani fan tuoi che la catena.

All these monitions were, however, lost on the Ministry, and behold the result ! The cry for a Repeal of the Union is gathering strength from all quarters of Ireland, and beginning to be re-echoed by many even in England itself.

In person Mr. Sheil is rather below the middle size. His figure is not massive, and it wants erectness and dignity. But his dark and sparkling eye is full of fire and varied expression ; and there is great playfulness and a sort of light and sprightly satire about his lips. His voice is in the upper notes peculiarly shrill and unpleasantly piercing, but in the lower tones he renders it powerfully effective by his acquaintance with those little histrionic artifices of pauses, starts, and intonations, which however effective at great meetings in Ireland, are certainly misplaced in the English Parliament. If Mr. Sheil would labour less after effect, and speak with more stillness and repose, and in a less theatrical tone and less stilted diction, he would produce much greater effect, for his views are general and capacious ; and though his mind is naturally subtle and logical, yet he is also a man of great natural shrewdness and of strong common sense. His political views have always been moderate ; his public character is without reproach ; and in private life he appears to be beloved and honoured by all who know him. Of his character as a dramatist, or as a man of literature, it is not necessary here to speak. Suffice it to say he is a man of considerable attainment as a classical scholar, and has written a great deal in the periodical press of our day.

#### THE EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE.

That before long, something must and will be done on an extended scale for the education of the people, there can be no doubt. It is, therefore, highly important, that the Dissenters, as a body, should be prepared to state with distinctness and decision, what they will accept, and what they will oppose. The resources of private benevolence are confessedly inadequate to the task of bringing the schoolmaster to every man's door. In large towns, a great deal has undoubtedly been effected by enterprising and benevolent individuals ; but in villages and thinly scattered districts, comparatively little has been, or can be done. The difficulty of raising a sufficient sum to afford a decent maintenance for a respectable schoolmaster, is, in these situations, generally too great to be overcome without some compromise of principle. As a natural result, persons are frequently appointed to the office, whose only qualification is to be found in their deriving emolument from some other occupation, such as that of parish clerk or sexton, by the aid of which they are enabled to maintain themselves, and thus keep open the school doors. Now it is in cases like these, that the aid of Government is indispensably necessary. How it may be most effectually imparted, is an interesting and as yet, an open question.—*Eclectic Review.*

## PURIFICATION OF CORRUPT BOROUGH AND CORRUPT CONSTITUENCIES.

---

THE business of Wednesday, the 26th of February, consisted almost entirely of a discussion on the two cases of the Warwick and Liverpool Elections, which, though separate questions, may be conveniently treated of under one head, as they were discussed on the same evening, and involve one common principle.

It must be matter of deep regret, that when the opportunity presented itself, on the passing of the Reform Bill, some one uniform standard of qualification was not adopted for voters in all parts of the country, and no anomalies or exceptions to the standard any where permitted to exist. It is also greatly to be regretted, that the vote by ballot was not made a part of that Reform Bill, for the protection of honest voters, and the preservation of the public morals. From a neglect of these two improvements, it happens that there are very many of the old constituencies left in almost as bad a state since, as they were before, the passing of the Reform Bill; some, as in the case of Warwick, from the overwhelming influence of an aristocratic family; and others, as in the case of Liverpool, from the ignorance and profligacy of the large body of freemen.

We conceive, however, that instead of applying a remedy to each particular case, as is now the course intended, it would be far better to take the whole of the Reform Bill under consideration, and revise all those parts of it which require amendment, so as to render the profligacy and delinquency now intended to be punished, almost impossible to be repeated, instead of waiting for new cases of crime, and punishing each as they occur. In short, we think the prevention of any disease, wherever possible, better than its cure; and in political diseases even more so than in physical ones.

The cases of Warwick and Liverpool have been so often before the public, that it would be tiresome in the extreme to our readers to repeat the debates on either. We content ourselves, therefore, with stating the fact, that the measure for *enlarging* and purifying the constituency of Warwick, by adding thereto the ten pound householders of Leamington; and the measure for *contracting* and purifying the constituency of Liverpool, by disfranchising the freemen as such, and retaining as voters, those only who in their capacity of ten pound householders may be entitled to the suffrage—are in a fair way of being carried, and will probably not meet with any opposition after this. To show the necessity of such purification, we subjoin a portion only of the evidence on the Liverpool case especially.

For a series of years preceding the Reform Act, the Liverpool Elections of Members of Parliament and municipal officers were notorious for every species of political venality and corruption. The great majority of the freemen being persons of the most humble class of life, were accessible to the usual arts of bribery, treating, and unconstitutional influence; and it has long been undeniable, that the *purse*, not the *principles*, of candidates obtained their return.

The early origin and long duration of this infamous system was remarkably disclosed before the Liverpool Corporation Inquiry in November last, in the following evidence of an old and eminent solicitor, Mr. Woods:

Mr. Woods was then examined.—I am an attorney; was articled in Liverpool in 1788; admitted in 1793, and have resided here since. In 1790 I commenced my electioneering career. Espoused the side of Colonel Tarleton, the liberal side, there being three candidates; all came down to canvass; after some days, Tarleton found there was a coalition, and left Liverpool in despair. His opponent rather hastily closed the taps; thus created a mutiny in the camp; the closing of the taps opened their eyes, and they discovered, all at once, that Tarleton was the fittest man. They went about the streets with his colours, and increased like a snowball. (Applause.) Tarleton's friends took advantage of this, encouraged such a feeling, and went to the poll. There was a sham bar to split votes for him. With great difficulty the first day was got over. The next day Tarleton returned, and carried all before him. Our opponents began to fight us, but we then beat them, driving the Mayor and the Recorder out of the Exchange. Before the election was over, Lord Penryn ran away, and Bamber Gascoyne was taken ill. Tarleton stood at the head of the poll. After all was over, a subscription was entered into, and each burgess who voted for Tarleton received 2s. 6d. for his independent vote.

This stirring up of the multitude became very serious, for it led to Common-hall the next year, which led to two trials at Lancaster as to who had the power to make bye-laws, the Common Council or the whole burgesses. Was at Lancaster in 1792, when one trial came on, and in the Court of King's Bench in 1793, when the third new trial was granted. Was then in the office of the London attorneys employed by the Liverpool burgesses, and shortly after a letter came with the news that all was over, as the subscriptions were at an end. At the election he named the treating went on, and also in 1796, when witnesses kept a check for Tarleton. In 1802, Mr. Birch was a candidate, and there was a puncheon of rum with the head taken out, and distributed among "the independent burgesses." In 1806 the Whigs were in power, and Mr. Roscoe was returned. He then had more friends than at any time before or since; whether they were expectants or not cannot say, but it was likely, for we never had them again. (Laughter.) Much money was spent then, and bribery with cash commenced. In 1812 I got promoted, and was made captain of a district. I had fourteen lieutenants under my command. I had many houses to attend to, and had to make a great many short speeches. The speech usually was, "Is all the beef and ale done?" and the invariable answer was, "It is!" Some of my lieutenants used to make long speeches; but my short speech, with the beef and ale to back it, made more impression than all their oratory. I was the innocent cause of much mischief, for these gentlemen became orators, and we never could silence them since, from their talking so much. (Much laughter.) There is no getting through business at any public meeting since. I advocated the cause of Messrs. Brougham and Creevy. We spent 17,000*l.*, paid 14,000*l.*, and got 3000*l.* in debt, which is not yet paid. We were defeated, as usual. In 1816, Mr. Canning was re-elected, and Mr. Leyland was started to oppose him. I got so often defeated that I gave it up. I only won once in thirty-five years, and then I took to Mayor-making. Between the election of 1812 and 1816, I became very intimate with Mr. Leyland, our rich banker. He told me very often

he was determined to become a candidate to represent the town in Parliament, and we thought it important to have a friendly mayor at the time of the election. General Green (a notorious man, that most people would recollect as having great influence with the low burgesses), came to me, and asked if I had any objection to Mr. Wright (the present mayor) becoming mayor. Mr. Leyland and myself consulted, and we told Green he might make him mayor if he thought fit. Soon afterwards Mr. Leyland came to me and said, "Mr. Wright will not do for us." I said, "Why did you not say so sooner? I am committed to Green, and do not know how to be off." I added, "A thought strikes me how to get out of this. I'll send Green out to Mr. Wright to ask him if he will call public meetings on a requisition being sent to him." I fully expected he would refuse, but he deceived me, for he said he would. So we were in for it. Then we set about making two balliffs; and fixed on Mr. George Drinkwater and Mr. Edward Pearson. The latter was in indifferent health, and we substituted Mr. J. D. Case, knowing him to be one of our friends.

When the election came on Mr. Leyland did not become a candidate. In 1820, we made him mayor; and in 1821 we proposed his nephew, Mr. Bullen. Mr. Cyrus Morrall and myself were the only persons who took an active part in giving the money away. Early on the morning of election I met Mr. Leyland, opposite the Athenæum, in Church-street, and in talking about the election of his nephew for mayor, he said, "My advice is to spare neither exertion nor expense. I care not who is mayor." Looking at the future, I consider his meaning was, that he would offer himself as a candidate for a seat in Parliament. I then saw Mr. Morrall, told him what had passed, and said that I considered it equivalent to a *carte blanche*, that he would be blamed if we did not win the election, and proposed to spend the money pretty freely. How it was I don't know, but the money was not forthcoming at first. About twelve o'clock we were very nearly beaten. I was told that, by an arrangement between the parties, not more than 6s. was to be paid to each burgess for his vote. Hearing that our opponents had broken their agreement, by giving ale in addition to the 6s., we commenced giving 10s. or 12s. a head. Our opponents followed us, but we kept over their heads, having the longer purse of the two. A placard was printed, offering 30*l.* a tally. One of those was posted opposite our opponents' committee-room, and they came over to us. I proposed to have a board painted, with "50*l.* a tally," and have it carried up and down Castle-street, that every one might see the system, but we only gave 4*l.* a-head, and were successful. In 1824, some of us subscribed 5*l.* a piece, at the election of Mr. Hollinshead, in the hope that he would call a Common-hall. We were successful, and I got 3*l.* back out of my 5*l.* I am not aware that I have any more to say, but as I was summoned here I thought I should tell what I knew.

The subsequent Reports and Minutes of Evidence of Committees of the House of Commons disclose a continuous system of bribery, profligacy, and demoralization, unexampled in the history of corrupt elections in this country.

The recent Commons' Committee reported (27th July, 1833), as follows:—

"That bribery and corruption have existed in the election of Members of Parliament and Chief Magistrates for the Borough of Liverpool, and in some cases to an ENORMOUS amount.

"That Your Committee have confined their inquiries to the corrupt practices existing in the elections of Chief Magistrates and Members of Parliament since the year 1823 inclusive.

"And your Committee have not instituted any further inquiry into bribery and corruption alleged to have been practised at the election of 1832, such inquiry having been the immediate object of the former Committee, and having been already reported upon by such Committee to your Honourable House.

"That between the years 1823 and 1826, both inclusive, and in the year 1828, the elections do not seem to have been keenly contested, and that there is no evidence of particular bribery or treating having been resorted to.



"That at the contested election for Mayor in 1827, the price of votes began at the sum of 6s. each, and rose to 20l.—and at the contested election for a Member for the representation of the borough in 1830, the price began at 2l. and rose to 60l., and in one instance to 80l.

"That at this contest, in 1827, for Mayor, the election cost each Candidate, or his friends, 7,000l. or 8,000l., and that, at this contest, in 1830, for a Representative, the election cost each Candidate, or his friends, upwards of 40,000l.

"That from documents and evidence on the Minutes of this Committee, it appears that 2,661 Individual Freemen of the Borough, at this election, were systematically bribed, and that no evidence has been tendered before this Committee to refute this imputed bribery.

"That of the 2,661 freemen thus bribed in 1830, 1,800 of the same persons still remain on the register entitled to vote, and that your Committee deem it proper to report to your House, that the Burgesses, or old Freemen, are the only persons entitled to vote at the annual elections of Chief Magistrate and Bailiffs for the Borough."

The contest in 1830, for one Representative, on the death of Mr. HUSKISSON, cost the "friends" of the Candidates, EIGHTY THOUSAND POUNDS expended in Bribery and Treating. Extraordinary arrangements for facilitating and concealing the bribery were deliberately made, and the payment of Voters was conducted on the most systematic plan. The price of Votes, which at the commencement of the Election was 5l., rose before its conclusion to 60l.; and in some instances, even larger sums were given. The TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED FREEMEN proved to have been bribed might not have included the gross number thus depraved; but *proof* of the corruption of that number—and that *eighteen hundred* now remain on the Register—was incontestibly given before the Committee. The Bribery of the Freemen has been presented as a nuisance to the Grand Jury of Liverpool. That the principles, as well as the habits of the Freemen are equally depraved, and accustomed to bribery, was singularly shown in the evidence of a Freeman of the name of JOHN HUNTINGDON (of the age of 33 years, a Freeman by birth and servitude), before the Corporation Commissioners, in reply to the testimony of Mr. Woods:—

"O—I'll suppose a case, Sir,—I'll suppose a case;—suppose there are two Candidates, and a poor man has made up his mind to vote for one. Suppose that he has actually got his hat on, and the door in his hand, and a knock comes to the door. [*Here the witness suited the action to the word by knocking on the front of the jury-box.*] Some gentlemen come in and say, 'Well, have you voted?'—'No.'—'Large sums are going. We'll give you 20l. to vote for such a one.' (*Laughter.*) Well, suppose that was the very man he intended to vote for; suppose he had a family depending upon him; I say that man would be a rascal to his family if he did not take it. (*Much laughter.*) You'll observe, gentlemen, I mean if he does not go against his conscience. (*Renewed laughter.*) I do say that if he does not, provided he does not go against his conscience, there is no bribery. That is my opinion of bribery." (*Laughter.*)

It was also given in evidence on the same occasion, that within the last twenty-five or thirty years, "nearly a QUARTER of a MILLION has been spent in Liverpool Elections."

## SIR WILLIAM INGILBY'S MOTION FOR A REPEAL OF THE MALT TAX.

THE success of Lord Chandos's motion for the Relief of the Agriculturists, had led to a strong belief that Ministers would have quite as close a division on Sir W. Ingilby's motion for the Repeal of the Malt Tax, which came on on the evening of Friday, February 27th; more especially, as it had been carried last Session, though subsequently rescinded by a second vote of the House. The attendance was, therefore, unusually large, there being at one time nearly 500 members in the House, which is considerably more than the body of the House will hold, and therefore very many members were obliged to take their seats in the gallery.

Sir William Ingilby introduced the motion, in a speech more remarkable for the attempts at facetiousness which it displayed, and from the laughter which it excited, than for any thing new in the way of fact or argument; and this was considered by all parties, as far as we could gather their opinions, fatal, from the beginning, to the success of the motion itself. This is, no doubt, very unreasonable: for, however injudicious the manner of treating a subject by the member who introduces it may be, the principles and the facts of the case must remain the same. But popular assemblies are unfortunately as much governed by passion as by reason; and therefore it happened that though Lord Chandos obtained for his motion a minority within four of the Ministerial numbers, Sir William Ingilby could only obtain for his motion a minority of 101 below the Government party.

Of Sir William's speech, it would be difficult to give an abstract, and quite a waste of time and space to print the whole. We, therefore, content ourselves with mentioning, that after having gone over a number of propositions for repairing the loss of the Revenue if the Malt Tax were taken off, the principal of which propositions were, to remove the tax on beer, to increase the duty on spirits and wines, to tax the "hells" or gambling-houses of London, as well as their frequenters, to tax the titles of nobility, to revive the tax on leather, &c. &c., he moved as an amended resolution,

"That this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, with a view to take into its consideration the propriety of partially or totally repealing the duty on Malt."

Many of the other speeches delivered on this occasion were much more to the purpose than that of the hon. mover: and from these we make a selection of the most important parts.

The Marquis of CHANDOS most cordially supported the motion. He had hoped that a measure of relief would have proceeded from the Government, but failing that, he could not do otherwise than give his full support to the present

proposition. He would put it to hon. members to say, whether they thought that they could, with any show of reason or justice, refuse to go into an inquiry—he hoped they would do no such thing—he hoped they would show the agriculturists that the causes of their distress were fairly looked into; and he begged Ministers to remember, that if they did not speedily and decisively show a disposition at least to put an end to the causes of that discontent and disorganization which prevailed through various parts of the country, they might be assured of this—that there existed the utmost hazard of those discontents arising to such a height as that no Government could hope to arrest their progress. He could but declare his full concurrence with the petitioners who had so often of late represented to the house the necessity of an inquiry such as was then proposed; he hoped therefore that the house would agree to the motion, and see how far that tax could be reduced.

On the question being put,

Mr. WARBURTON rose—the cry for Lord Althorp was, however, very general. The hon. member said, that he should not have risen then had he seen the slightest disposition on the part of the noble lord (Althorp) to address the house. If the object of the hon. baronet's motion had been to abolish any monopoly, or to repeal any tax which operated injuriously towards the industrious classes of the community, it would have received his (Mr. Warburton's) most willing support; but he could only regard the hon. baronet's proposition as an attempt on the part of the agricultural interest to put their hands into the pockets of the people. (Cries of "No," and "Hear.") It appeared to him that the agricultural interest wished to raise a revenue from the other interests in the state, in order to place that revenue in their own pockets. ("Hear, hear," and "No, no.") He believed the substance of the hon. baronet's comical budget was a proposal to repeal the malt-tax, and reimpose on the people the beer-tax. The hon. baronet had also suggested the expediency of imposing additional duties on spirits and wine, and he might easily have been mistaken for a member of a temperance society, had he not concluded by proposing the repeal of the malt-tax. (Hear.) If (Mr. Warburton) had certainly no object on to lower the price of beer to agricultural labourers, notwithstanding that the magistrates and clergymen who had given evidence before the beer committee last session attributed all the crimes committed in the country to the low price of beer ("No, no,") in conjunction with the establishment of beer-shops (hear, hear); but he was opposed to the hon. baronet's plan, because it was essentially a proposition to impose a tax on the consumers of beer in towns who were too poor to brew for themselves, in order that the growers of barley might place the produce in their own pockets. ("Hear," and "No.")

Mr. BENNET denied that the removal of the malt-duty would raise the price of beer to the consumers in towns, and said that the interests, not of the lower classes of the people, but of the great brewers alone, were considered in the continuance of that tax. The house had been told that the landed interest wanted to obtain the repeal of the malt-tax in order to put the money in their own pockets. Now he was ready to admit that the landed interest would obtain some relief by the removal of the duty, and in their present distressed condition they were entitled to relief; but the benefit would not be exclusively theirs, for it would be shared equally between the consumer and the producer. (Hear, hear.) If the landowners took his advice, they would adopt every measure having a tendency to lower prices. Many years back they had neglected to prepare for a return to a metallic currency, and they had suffered severely for their want of prudence. Let them not betray a similar want of foresight with regard to the Corn Laws. Persevering endeavours would be made to obtain the repeal of those laws, and that they would be successful in the end he could not but believe. Under these circumstances, it was the interest of the landowners to prepare for the evil day, by lowering the price of the articles which they produced, and they could only effect this object by reducing the cost of cultivation. He considered it to be the interest of the landowners to repeal every tax affecting the production of the articles of life, and for this reason he was an advocate for a property tax, which

pressed upon the rich, and not upon the poor. He recollected that when a property-tax existed in this country it was run down by the clamour of itinerant orators, who possessed no property whatever. Since that period the people had become more enlightened, and a property tax would, he had no doubt, be now popular in the country. He certainly thought that every gentleman, before he voted in favour of the hon. baronet's motion, ought to be prepared with a substitute to supply the deficiency in the revenue which the repeal of the malt duty would create, for unless that deficiency was supplied, the national faith, the maintenance of which ought to be the first care of Parliament, could not be preserved. (Hear, hear.) He was prepared with a substitute in the shape of a property tax, and he therefore considered himself at liberty to vote in favour of the hon. baronet's motion.

Colonel MANNING thought the question under discussion very important in a financial point of view, and still more important as affecting the morals of the humbler classes of the community. He condemned the late Government for having established those pests of society the beer shops, and for having reduced the duty on ardent spirits, in consequence of which a state of demoralization had been produced, only equalled by that which existed during the last century, when Sir R. Walpole found it necessary to impose prohibitory duties on the importation of foreign spirits. Since the reduction of the duty, the consumption of British spirits had increased from 3,000,000 to 7,000,000 of gallons in England, from 2,000,000 to 5,000,000 of gallons in Scotland, and from 2,000,000 to 9,000,000 in Ireland. He was an advocate for the repeal of the malt-duty, because he considered beer a more wholesome beverage for the people than ardent spirits; but he would have a total abolition of the tax, for a partial repeal would render the maintenance of all the existing machinery for its collection necessary. He disclaimed any participation in the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Bridport (Mr. Warburton), and saw nothing in the proposition of the hon. baronet which at all had a tendency to operate injuriously towards the inhabitants of towns. (Hear, hear.) If the hon. baronet's motion was carried, and the duty on beer re-imposed, the price of that beverage would not be raised, because the repeal of the malt-tax would be more than equivalent for the renewal of the beer duty. He was confident that the deficiency in the revenue occasioned by the abolition of the malt-tax might be supplied by effecting a saving in the expenditure of the military establishment and those of the colonies.

Colonel WOOD could not take that opportunity of remarking, without meaning any disrespect to the hon. baronet, that he had trifled with one of the most important subjects which it was possible to bring under the consideration of the House. (Hear.) The total abolition of the malt-tax he (Colonel Wood) considered practically impossible; for he believed it was quite hopeless to think of being able to raise a tantamount income. At the same time he looked upon its partial repeal as absolutely necessary, in order to remedy in some degree the difficulties under which agriculture was at present suffering. If the house would agree to repeal one half of the malt-tax, and impose 5s. on each barrel of beer, it would not increase the price to the consumer above one halfpenny a-pot, while the greatest possible advantage would accrue generally by way of relief to the agriculturists. The hon. and gallant member expressed in conclusion his determination to vote for the committee, although he could not but declare his dissatisfaction at the manner in which the question had been treated.

Sir R. PEEL then rose to address the house. He had come down under the impression that the proposition to be made was for a total repeal of the malt-tax (hear, hear), and he must say there was considerable inconvenience, a notice having been given that a specific proposal was to be made, in any hon. member coming forward, and in an instant, without any previous intimation of the change, introducing great and essential alterations in the purport and design of the original motion. (Hear, hear.) At the same time he was not sure that the nature of the proposition had been in the present case substantially altered; because the hon. baronet (Sir W. Ingilby) stated his conviction that little if any relief could be derived from a partial repeal of the malt duty; and his proposal, in fact, was to abolish the whole, promising to supply the deficiency of revenue that might

result from its total abolition by substituting certain other taxes, which certainly had been detailed with no small degree of facetiousness. (Hear, hear.) He did not apprehend that the proposal of the hon. baronet for a committee, was with the view of maturely considering the subject, and calmly investigating how the interests of agriculture would be influenced by a partial or total repeal of the malt-tax. (Hear, hear.) He feared there would be no inquiry, and no deliberation but some specific and sweeping proposition would at once be submitted to the committee, on which an immediate vote would be taken. (Hear, hear.) With respect to the general question of a total repeal of the malt duty, he still adhered to the opinions he had stated on a previous occasion. It was impossible to decide on its merits without looking at the state of the revenue; although he did not consider it necessary to view it in detail, as every gentleman could not but bear in mind the statement of the noble lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer a few nights since. His (Sir R. Peel's) deliberate and decided opinion, taking into consideration the present state of the revenue of the country, was, that the house could not consent to such an extensive reduction of taxation as would be implied in the total repeal of the malt-tax. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. COBBETT declared his determination to support the motion. Partial repeal would, in his view of the matter, do very little, if any good at all. It had been proved before one of their committees, upon the testimony of certain gentlemen, that all the evils of the country arose from the low price of beer. Undoubtedly, the low price of beer encouraged the beer shops, but to him it appeared that the real remedy for the evils arising from the beer shops was to be found in the repeal of the malt-tax; a great evil those beer shops certainly were, but it was not to be corrected as some gentlemen in their great wisdom proposed to correct it. Its correction was to be found in the repeal of the malt-tax, and in that alone. (Hear, hear.) A noble lord on a former occasion had said that the house ought rather to increase than to diminish the beer tax, because the low price of beer at present drove the labourers to resorts which were injurious to their health, their morals, and their pockets. Now he had a better remedy than that to propose, and that was the repeal of the malt-tax, which would enable every man to brew his own beer and to drink it by his own fire-side. (Hear, hear.) It was not so much the amount of the malt-tax to which he objected, as to the mischief which it inflicted in addition to the burden which it imposed. All taxes, lay them where you will, first or last, continue to spread themselves over the community. Place your taxes upon the titles of your nobility, and it will not be long before such taxes are felt even by the lowest of your people. It might be said that, if such were the case, it was indifferent what tax you proposed to lay upon the nation. And so it was, unless the tax proved injurious in its operation. Now this tax, this malt-tax, drove the people to the beer-houses, and what was worse, drove yearly servants out of the farm-houses. (Hear, hear.) Every man who knew any thing about the agricultural population, knew the lamentable change for the worse which had taken place among them, since the farmers had been compelled to drive the young men in their employment from their homesteads. (Hear, hear.) It was that circumstance, more than any other, which had produced such a change in the manners and the morals of our country people; and the cause of it—and he believed one chief cause of it—was the heavy amount of the malt-tax.

Lord ALTHORP said, with regard to the motion which had been submitted to the house by the hon. member for Lincolnshire (Sir Wm. Ingilby), he (Lord Althorp) felt convinced that it had been altered from its original wording, in consequence of the suggestions and advice of some persons who conceived they had more tact than the hon. mover himself. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) But be that as it might, he (Lord Althorp) was sure they had mistaken their work in the present instance; nay, he believed that if the motion had been brought forward in its original shape, it would have received more support than it was likely to do now. For what was its nature? It asked for a committee of the whole house, to consider what practicable reduction could be made to benefit the agricultural interest. But were the difficulties which attended on such a motion duly considered? First, there would be the different suggestions of hon. mem-

bers with regard to the practicability of reductions, one recommending a reduction of expenditure, and upon this all the estimates of the year would depend, while a third would introduce the question on the substitution of one set of taxes for another. He verily believed the budget opened by the hon. member who had last spoken did not materially differ from that with which the hon. member for Lincolnshire (Sir William Ingilby) had favoured them. (A laugh.) Next came the hon. member for Wiltshire (Mr. Bennett) with his proposition of a property tax. Why, the whole of the functions of the Government would by this means be totally superseded. He (Lord Althorp) well recollected when a motion some years ago was brought forward for a committee of the whole house to consider the taxation of the country, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer resisted it on the distinct ground that if the Government were to consent to such a motion they would be in a manner abandoning their functions. On this ground, too, the house supported the minister, and did not feel inclined to assume into its own hands a function which properly belonged to him. He (Lord Althorp) could never give his consent to such a proposition. The hon. member again said that an increased duty ought to be imposed on spirits. He (Lord Althorp) fully concurred in the principle that the utmost possible amount of taxation ought to be raised from spirituous liquors, for if ever there was a legitimate object of taxation that object was ardent spirits. But when he looked to the probable result of an increase of duty in the excitement to illicit distillation and smuggling, he did not think that its imposition would conduce either to the improvement of public morality, or to an increase in the legitimate profits of the consumption. This he knew, that when in 1830 the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Goulburn) increased the duty on spirits by 600,000*l.* instead of an advantage accruing to the revenue, there was a deficiency in that account alone of 100,000*l.* The legitimate consumption of the article had been diminished by the imposition of the tax. He therefore saw no hope of effecting any increase of revenue proportionate to the loss which would be occasioned by the repeal of the malt-tax, by a tax on spirits. But the hon. member proposed that the portion of the malt-tax now paid by the distillers should be remitted and converted into a direct tax on spirits. He (Lord Althorp) was aware the question was a difficult one; but he must remark one thing, that both the illicit distiller and the fair trader would, in the purchase of the malt, after the remission of the tax, be upon an equal footing, but the illicit distiller, having no tax to pay on the spirit, would, from the increased price in the market, obtain an immense advantage. Seeing, therefore, the subject in this point of view, believing as he did that the appointment of the committee would place the house in an inconvenient position, that it would be utterly impossible, in the present state of the finances of the country, to take off the whole of the malt-duty, and that the taking off a part would only occasion loss to the revenue without sensibly benefiting the agriculturists, he could not bring himself to agree to the motion of the hon. member for Lincolnshire. Entertaining these opinions, he hoped and trusted that the motion of the hon. baronet would not be carried. If they should vote the appointment of a committee without seeing their way clearly, it would be a bad thing, and, if they saw their way clearly, it would be still worse to go into a committee at all; for what would be the consequence? Why, that they would have twenty different plans to consider, twenty different projects to discuss, and that in the end their time would be totally lost, if they should adopt, which he hoped the house would not, the proposition of the hon. baronet on this occasion. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. HUME said, that though they would not have the vote of the noble lord for this motion, the arguments which he had adduced were really all in favour of it. The noble lord had enumerated the many difficulties with which the subject was surrounded, but the present was only a motion for inquiry, to see whether those difficulties might not be overcome. He believed that this was the first instance of the Ministers of the Crown, with a surplus revenue that might be appropriated to the repeal of taxation, not having made up their minds as to what taxes they would reduce, and telling the house that they left it open to every interest to fight as best they could for their own particular relief. (Hear.) He (Mr. Hume) was anxious for the reduction of every tax that possibly could be reduced,

and he should therefore vote for the present motion. He conceived that the reduction of the malt-duty would be productive of advantage to the agricultural, the manufacturing, and the commercial interests of the country. He took for granted that if this burden should be removed from the agricultural interest, the landed gentry would not oppose the placing the corn laws upon a proper and permanent footing. As His Majesty's Ministers declined to enter on this inquiry, it was for the house to do so. The present motion certainly did in a degree trench upon the province of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the noble lord had to thank himself for that, seeing that he refused to do his duty. There was no doubt that this tax was burdensome and unequal in its operation, and the house would therefore go into an inquiry to see whether taxes, even to the extent of 4,500,000*l.*, might not be substituted in its stead. He (Mr. Hume) had no hesitation in saying, that if the house should go into a committee, a substitute might be provided for this tax, so as to relieve the productive industry of the country, and at the same time to meet all engagements necessary to sustain the credit of the country. It was necessary for the house to take this question into its own hands, seeing that His Majesty's Ministers were not decided in the part they should take. Recollecting the arguments employed by the noble lord and some of those who sat beside him on a former occasion in support of the repeal of this very identical tax, he really thought that the noble lord should not object to his motion.

After a short speech from Mr. O'Connell, in favour of the motion, and a brief reply from Sir W. Ingilby, the question was put to a division, and lost; the numbers being, For the appointment of a Committee, 170; against it, 271.

#### CONNECTION OF IGNORANCE WITH CRIME.

Debasing ignorance prevails to an extent which could not be credited, were it not verified by the closest investigation. The facts which have been elicited respecting the moral and intellectual state of those counties which have been disgraced by riots and acts of incendiarism, are truly affecting, and yet they are but a fair representation of the actual state of our peasantry. We call ourselves an enlightened nation, an educated people; and yet, out of nearly seven hundred prisoners put on trial in four counties, upwards of two hundred and sixty were as ignorant as the savages of the desert;—they could not read a single letter. Of the whole seven hundred, only one hundred and fifty could write, or even read with ease; and (in the words of one of the chaplains of the gaols) nearly the whole number were totally ignorant with regard to the nature and obligations of true religion.—*Official Report.*

#### IMPORTANCE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.

The principles which regulate the wages of labour form, without any exception, the most interesting and the most important division of Political Economy. The labouring classes compose the great bulk of every community; and a country is happy or miserable, as they are well or ill supplied with the necessaries, comforts, and enjoyments of life. The study of Political Economy, if it did not teach the way in which labour may obtain an adequate reward, might serve to gratify a merely speculative curiosity, but could scarcely conduce to any purposes of practical utility. It claims the peculiar attention of the benevolent and good, mainly because it explains the causes, which depress and elevate wages, and thereby points out the means, by which we may mitigate the distress, and improve the condition, of the great majority of mankind. Political Economy is not, as has been erroneously stated, the appropriate science of the statesman and the legislator; it is peculiarly and emphatically, *the Science of the People.*—*Robert Torrens.*

## EQUALIZATION OF DUTIES ON EAST AND WEST INDIA SUGARS.

THIS is a subject of such vast importance to the commercial interests of the country, that we have on fifty, or we think we might safely say, a hundred occasions at least, endeavoured to draw public attention to it; but so slow is the progress of sound principles in commerce, as well as in politics, that we fear public attention must be called to it a hundred times more before the end will be attained. But we must be patient, and still persevere.

Whatever arguments might have been urged against the admission of East India sugar on the same terms as West India sugar, before the two great questions of the East India Monopoly and West India Slavery were settled, they all cease to have any foundation whatever since these great questions have been set at rest. We lament, therefore, to see that, either from the predominance of the West India interest in the House of Lords, where so many large holders of West India estates have seats, or from the unrepresented state of the East Indies in either House, or from both these causes acting together, the Ministers are obstinately determined to do nothing even towards improvement in a matter of such paramount importance as this.

The debate on the question came on, on going into the Committee of Ways and Means, which, from continued indisposition, we were unable to attend; we give some of the most striking portions of the debate, which speak for themselves.

LORD ALTHORP stated to the committee that it was not his intention to propose any alteration in the sugar duties from what the duty had been in the preceding year, neither did he mean to propose any alteration in the proportions in which those duties were payable. After the best consideration which His Majesty's Government could bestow upon the subject, they came to the conclusion that it would be highly unwise and inexpedient to make any change in those duties, or to take away from our West India colonies any advantage which they previously enjoyed. One of the grounds on which he made this observation was connected with the great measure of last session, the satisfactory operation of which had even gone beyond their expectations, and therefore he thought that it would be most injudicious to interfere in the slightest degree with any real or supposed advantage enjoyed by that portion of our colonial possessions. The only change he had to propose was one which had no reference either to the amount of the duties, or the proportion in which they were paid; it merely was, that the duties should be taken from the 5th of July, instead of from the 5th of April. He concluded by moving that the several duties on sugar and molasses, originally imposed by the 1st of William IV., cap. 61, be continued for one year.

MR. C. FERGUSSON complained that the East and West Indies were not put on the same footing with respect to the import of sugar into this country. It was full time that the rights of our East Indian possessions should be considered. On the present occasion, he should not divide the house, but he begged hon. members to bear in mind, that between this country and the East Indies there



was no reciprocity; the Indian cotton manufacture bore four times as much taxes as did that of this country; and what was the consequence? Hundreds of thousands were thrown out of employment, and perished for want, to the enormous profit of this country, and to the great loss of that.

Mr. EWART observed, that it had been most truly said that the manufactures of this country had overpowered the native fabrics of Hindostan. In that country the cotton manufacture had its origin, and it was now annihilated there. He begged the house also to look at the way in which the several duties which Parliament imposed affected the two countries. West India sugar paid 24s., East India 32s.; West India rum 9s., East India rum 15s.; West India coffee 6d., that of the East 9d.; North American tobacco 2s. 9d., East India 3s.; the pimento of the East paid 1s., while the pepper coming from the other parts of the world was charged only 3d. The arguments, too, used in favour of continuing the present duties appeared to him rather strange, when he viewed them in connexion with the reasoning by which on former occasions they were supported. He remembered well that the cry used to be "We cannot dispense with the sugar duties as they at present stand, seeing that slavery exists in our West India colonies;" and now the fact of the abolition of slavery was made a pretext for continuing the monopoly which those duties created. There was a very important petition, not yet presented to that house, but which, he trusted, very soon would be presented, upon the occasion of presenting which to the house he intended to make some observations; he was sure that when that petition came forward the house would feel that much attention would be due to its representations. Had it not been that the present proposition was made so suddenly, there would have been petitions on the subject from various parts of the country, for the feeling on the subject was much stronger than perhaps his Majesty's Government at all supposed.

Mr. WARBURTON regretted the course which the Government had thought proper to take in respect to those duties. After the report which had been made by that distinguished chymist, Dr. Ure, there could now be no doubt that on the export of refined sugar there was in effect a bonus of 5s. per cwt., and if the whole quantity exported were calculated according to that rate, it would amount to a sum of several hundred thousand pounds. That, therefore, was amongst the subjects which ought to occupy the attention of the house when they came to a general revision of the taxation of the country.

Mr. HURT said that East and West India produce were entitled to equal protection, for he could see no ground of justice or policy upon which any distinction could be drawn between our possessions in the East and in the West.

Mr. P. THOMSON, in answer to the question put by the hon. member for Bridport, said, that he could not go the length of admitting that there was a bonus amounting to 5s., yet he had every reason to believe that it amounted to 4s. at the least. The result certainly had been a great loss to the revenue and to the public—to the former 80,000*l.*, to the latter possibly not less than 700,000*l.*, and therefore the subject had engaged the most serious and attentive consideration of His Majesty's Government; but that, for the reasons already given by his noble friend, they thought it best not to make any change for the present in the scale of duties. He wished it, however, to be understood that the whole matter was a question of time, and when the caution which the great measure of last session required was no longer necessary, the best consideration of the Government should be devoted to the subject.

Lord ALTHORP said that certainly the sugar duties did form a question. At the present moment an important change was going forward in our West Indian possessions, and that change especially demanded that nothing should be done calculated to interfere even in appearance with the existing condition of the West India interest. He fully adopted the general principles upon which an alteration was advocated, but the difficulty was as to the present time.

Sir R. PEEL hoped that when the question was next brought forward, it would be discussed upon general grounds, and that it would be borne in mind that discriminating duties, as affecting the produce of separate colonies, were in a high degree calculated to alienate the affections of one of them; for they could not but

be looked upon as analogous to discriminating with reference to nations with whom we might for the time, be on terms of amity; and surely the moment such duties were imposed, the party suffering might at once be expected to treat a proceeding of that nature as an act of direct hostility, calling for retaliation at the first favourable opportunity. To this topic he felt it the more necessary to call the attention of the house when he recollected the growing intelligence of the inhabitants of India, and the certainty that the time was at hand when they would resent any thing like injustice. The declaration they had heard as to the present being merely a question of time was highly important, especially to those who might have it in contemplation to invest capital in the colonies; he, therefore, requested that there should be a distinct declaration that the present was merely a temporary arrangement.

Lord ALTHORP was understood to reply, that the arrangement now proposed was in consequence of the state of the colonies, and was not to be regarded as final.

### HISTORY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

At the Reformation, a new era may be said to have commenced. No sooner had the doctrines of the Reformed Faith struck their roots deeply into those States of Europe which now became professedly Protestant, than with one accord they began to make suitable provision for the religious education of their youth. Holland, Geneva, Switzerland, and Scotland, vied with each other in the good work of providing schools of elementary instruction for their whole population. Ignorance was then universally recognized as the enemy of Divine Truth, and, at the same time, was wisely deemed one of the greatest of political evils. Had the life of Edward the Sixth been spared but a few years longer, England would probably have been saved from the disgrace of being for centuries the only Protestant country in which elementary education was not taken up as a great public duty. The Reformers themselves were by no means insensible to its importance; on the contrary, frequent indications of a feeling in favour of educating the poor may be traced in their writings. The Homilies of the Established Church, published by authority, contain strong admonitions to "serving men," to "get good learning." Private endowments for schools were everywhere encouraged; and charters were freely granted with a view to their security and permanence. Still, the good work languished; and it was not till above a century after the Reformation, that Cranmer's wish for "grammar schools to be founded in every shire of England," began to take effect. It is certain, that, in the times of the Commonwealth, a considerable portion of the people could both read and write. The civil wars would doubtless occasion the suspension of many of these establishments; and the atrocious policy followed by the Stuart family after the Restoration, would effectually prevent their being re-organized. It excites no surprise, therefore, to find that, in the reign of Queen Anne, "the notorious ignorance and viciousness of the working classes" began seriously to attract public attention, and that many benevolent persons were desirous of establishing charity-schools. In the *Spectator* of February, 1712, there is a paper on this subject; in which these schools are spoken of as "the greatest instances of public spirit the age has produced." A writer in the *Guardian* of the following year, indulges in the expectation, that the "next generation" would "scarcely present a single instance of a child unable to read and write, and unacquainted with the principles of the Christian faith." We shall shortly have occasion to see how far these expectations have been fulfilled. Since then, a hundred and twenty years have rolled away. We cannot stop to trace our way through them. Those who may be desirous of minutely investigating the moral and intellectual condition of the lower orders of Englishmen during that time, will find various sources of information open to them. The journals of Whitfield and Wesley will throw light on the state of things in their day; and the records of the Special Commissions of 1831, together with the recent report of the Commissioners on the Poor Laws, will serve to illustrate that in our own. England may thus be compared at different periods of her history; and the advancement or deterioration of the popular mind at particular seasons, be in some degree ascertained.

## ARMY ESTIMATES—REDUCTION IN THE MILITARY • ESTABLISHMENTS.

ON Friday evening, the 27th of Feb., Mr. Ellice brought forward the Army Estimates for the year, and all parties appeared to agree in awarding the praise of great improvement in the Estimates themselves, as well as in the manner in which they are now laid before the House. We are glad, whenever the occasion offers, to bestow praise rather than censure, and we must say we think Sir James Graham, as First Lord of the Admiralty, and Mr. Ellice, as Secretary at War, are both entitled to the thanks of the House and the country, for the great reductions in expense, and additions to efficiency, which they have made in their respective departments. The debate on the Army Estimates was very long, and full of minute details; through which our readers generally would find it tiresome to wade. We select, therefore, such portions only of the speeches of those usually opposed to the Government, as are necessary to give a general understanding of the views which they take of Mr. Ellice's statement on this subject, and the changes and improvements made by him in his department as Secretary at War.

Mr. HUME said he must acknowledge that his right hon. friend had made his statement in a very able and masterly manner. (Hear, hear.) He could with sincerity say that he had never known an estimate for the army service so clearly laid before the house in all its details, or one that had been more candidly explained in all its points. He gave his right hon. friend full credit for the sincerity which he claimed, and for the desire which he expressed to make every possible reduction in the military expenditure of the country, and if his right hon. friend had in his hands the sole direction of the matter, he (Mr. Hume) would be perfectly satisfied to rely upon his promises and exertions. He gave his right hon. friend every credit for effecting the reforms and consolidations which he had promised last year, and he was sure his right hon. friend would do all he had promised to do in the course of the ensuing year. There was no getting the Ministers to reduce the expenditure unless the house applied some gentle force to them. (A laugh.) His right hon. friend had talked of those who wished for reductions to the amount of millions; he believed that in so speaking he alluded to him, (Mr. Hume.) Now he (Mr. Hume) seven years ago was considered as a man fit for Bedlam, because he proposed to take off 7,000,000*l.* of taxes, and yet that amount of taxes had been since reduced. He was glad to see his right hon. friend acting on those principles which he (Mr. Hume) had always advocated, and in which advocacy he had generally found a supporter in his right hon. friend. He was glad to see his right hon. friend carrying those principles and views into effect which he had advocated before he was Secretary at War. The reformed Parliament, however, would but ill discharge its duty, if it refused to accede to the proposition which it was his intention to move—namely, a reduction of 9,000 men from the amount calculated to remain of effective troops—81,000, which would still leave a force of upwards of 72,000 strong—a force greater than that maintained during the year 1823. In making this reduction he would not discharge from the service a single man without a pension, unless he should desire it; but as he understood that not less than 19,000 men were at present de-

sirous to leave the service, on merely obtaining their discharge, no expense would be entailed upon the country by an addition to the pension list from the reduction which he proposed. He felt himself bound again to repeat his satisfaction at the statement with which the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary of the Colonies, had opened the estimates, but as the question rested with the House of Commons, he hoped an opinion would be expressed upon the subject as had been before done by an unreformed Parliament. The hon. member concluded by moving, as an amendment, "the reduction of the effective strength of the army, as proposed, of 9,000 men."

Colonel EVANS contended, that if the military force kept up in the colonies was based upon population, there was no reason why the colonies should have 33,000 men to protect them, when 22,000 were found enough for Ireland. He particularly wished to know, also, why garrisons were maintained in islands, as if we had no navy? With respect to Ireland, he thought that if the Coercion Bill was worth any thing, it ought to have enabled the Government to dispense with keeping up so large a force there. The noble lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in 1822, had said that our colonies were to be considered as valuable either for commercial purposes, or for keeping up our military strength; but he (Colonel Evans) did not exactly see how colonies could add to our military strength, when forces were employed in the colonies which other parts of the empire might need.

Major BRAUCLERK was convinced that the statement which had that evening been laid before the house would give more satisfaction to the country than any act which had proceeded from the Government for a long time. (Hear, hear.) He had not been a flatterer of the Government, and hon. members would not suppose that he would give them his support on the present question on any grounds but what he believed sound; and really when he found his hon. friend the member for Middlesex coming forward with a proposal for the immediate reduction of 9,000 men, he could not go so far as his hon. friend seemed disposed to proceed. The consequence would be that the young men would leave the army and the old would remain in it, and in a year or two they would be obliged to give pensions to the old men, who would be disabled from further service. The conduct of Ministers on this occasion had been throughout mild, open, and fair, but if no further progress was made next year, he should be as ready to oppose Ministers as he was now to tender them his support.

SIR H. HARDINGE did not think it his duty as a public man to cripple the efficiency of the army by unnecessary reductions. His Majesty's Ministers were, in his opinion, the best judges of what the number of the army should be, as the proper consideration of the question depended on so many circumstances, and required so much patient and laborious investigation, that few but themselves could form any tolerable decision. The position in which the country was now placed was this, that we had arrived at the *minimum* of reduction. He would venture to say, that it would be found on experiment impossible to carry these reductions further.

At the close of the discussion, there was a division on the amendment of Mr. Hume, on which the numbers were: For the further reduction of 9,000 men 46. Against it 282. The List of the Minority will be found in its proper place. The House sat later than usual for the present session to-night, not adjourning till near two o'clock.

#### MAXIMUM OF WAGES.

The circumstances, which raise the maximum of wages to the highest point, are those in which a thickly-peopled country, excelling in manufacturing industry, carries on a perfectly free trade with thinly-peopled countries, in which none but soils of first-rate quality are under tillage.—Robert Torrens.

## MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY ON THE IMPRESSMENT OF SEAMEN.

ON Tuesday, March 4, a short debate occurred on a motion of Mr. O'Connell for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the laws respecting Juries in Ireland, which was refused by Ministers, and the motion was subsequently withdrawn. Another short debate followed on a motion of Mr. Hardy for leave to bring in a Bill to amend and consolidate the laws respecting bribery and expense at Elections, which was unopposed; and subsequently to this, Mr. Murray moved for and obtained leave to bring in a Bill to repeal the Foreign Enlistment Act, which had been carried through the House of Commons last Session, but was lost in the Lords.

After these followed the debate on Mr. Buckingham's Motion for a Committee of Inquiry on the subject of Impressment, which commenced about eight o'clock, and lasted till nearly twelve. The debate has been very faithfully reported in the newspapers generally; but, as many of the facts stated, and arguments urged, in support of the motion derive their principal force from the authorities on which they are grounded, we shall give in our next Number the documents alluded to in the course of the debate—which were taken to the House of Commons for the purpose of their being read, if their authenticity had been doubted, but which, when stated in substance, were not controverted, except in one instance only, and therefore were not, except in that single instance, read at length—we mean the letter from Liverpool; they will give, however, additional force to the arguments founded on them, by being introduced at length in a future Number, and for that we shall reserve them.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM said, that in rising to call the attention of the house to the motion of which he had given notice, for a Select Committee to inquire into the practicability of devising some plan for manning His Majesty's Navy, without recourse to forcible Impressment, he might, perhaps, be permitted to congratulate himself and the house at the removal of many of the objections which were urged to his motion on this subject last session. On that occasion, having at the express desire, and to suit the avowed convenience of His Majesty's Ministers, deferred that motion several times, he was taunted, in return for his courtesy, with the lateness of the period of the session at which the motion was brought forward, and this very lateness, caused as it was by His Majesty's Ministers themselves, was urged as a reason why the motion could not be acceded to, as there was then no time to consider of any substitute for the practice of Impressment, which the motion went to abolish. He had been determined, therefore, to avoid this objection now, by selecting the earliest period of the present session for a renewal of the discussion, in order that there might be ample time for a Committee to investigate the whole subject, and close their labours sufficiently early to admit of the proper measures being matured before the session was brought to a close. The interval had afforded him also, abundant opportunities of ascertaining the state of public opinion on this question in the principal seaports of the

kingdom, where the subject was best understood : as well as of collecting many new facts illustrative of the evils of Impressment, and of the general feeling of abhorrence, with which that system of human robbery and violation of all personal right was viewed. As, however, he was anxious that other honourable members should be heard on the subject, he would content himself with such a limited statement only of the case, as would show the house the grounds on which he asked their concurrence in his views : and justify to their own minds the granting him that support with which he ventured to hope they would now honour him. (Hear, hear.)

At this time of day it could scarcely be necessary to say much as to the cruelty and injustice of such a practice as Impressment. The noble lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had, in the last session, expressed his astonishment that he (Mr. Buckingham) should have compared such a system with slavery. But after mature reflection, he felt bound to say that no comparison could be more appropriate, as a moment's consideration would show. Let the house ask itself what were the principal features that characterized the Slave Trade, and Slavery, and what were its chief wrongs and sufferings that roused up the indignation of the whole British people. The answer would be this. Slavery was first characterized by the brutal and inhuman act of dragging a man from his own home and family by force, and compelling him, against his will, to enter a service of which he had a rooted abhorrence. Secondly, by compelling the slave thus dragged from his home, to labour for inadequate wages, for an indefinite length of time, and subject to the lash of the whip, if he offended the regulations imposed on him by his tyrant, or even evinced dissatisfaction with his hard lot. Thirdly, by subjecting to the severest torture of flogging, and sometimes even to the punishment of death, any attempt to desert from the state of suffering to which an act of tyranny and cruelty had alone consigned him. These were the characteristics of Slavery ; and to abolish this, the united voices of all classes of people in the British empire had been lifted up and heard. He contended, then, that the Impressment of Seamen for His Majesty's fleet was characterized by every one of these revolting features. The men were torn from their homes and families by force, and obliged to yield to the terrors of the armed pressgangs, by which they were dragged through the streets. They were made to labour against their will for inadequate wages, for an indefinite period of time, and kept in subjection by the infliction of the lash. And if they dared to desert, in the hope of regaining that home from which they had been thus forcibly torn, they were liable to the severest tortures of corporal punishment, and even to death itself. There was, then, little or no difference between the two systems ; for if, on the one hand, it might be said that the labour of the seaman was not so severe, and his food and clothing better than that of the slave, on the other hand it must be admitted, that the deprivation of personal liberty to a free-born Briton, and especially one of that profession, the chief charm of which is the liberty of action in the choice of the ship, the commander, and the station, must be far more galling to the mind than the same coercion would be to the native of Africa, to whom captivity in war, and slavery in labour, were familiarized by its being the common lot of all classes of his unhappy countrymen. He thought, therefore, that His Majesty's Ministers, who had brought forward the Bill for abolishing slavery in all the British Colonies, could not refuse their assent to a measure for abolishing slavery at home ; unless they were prepared to say that though adequate wages and good treatment would obtain sufficient cultivators for the Colonies without man-stealing and oppression, yet that the same inducements would not supply the fleet with seamen, and therefore Impressment must still continue. He did not, however, anticipate such a result ; and therefore he trusted, that while his motion met with no opposition from the Cabinet, it would be warmly supported by all those who had assisted, by their speeches or their votes, to give the deathblow to Slavery in the East and in the West. (Hear, hear.)

It had been said, however, that the seamen themselves were indifferent to the evil ; and that they had never petitioned for its abolition. Supposing that this had even been the case, it was no argument whatever against its injustice. Seamen, from their imperfect education and generally careless habits, are not likely

## IMPRESSMENT OF SEAMEN.

to have investigated the matter with the same care which landmen would bestow on any grievance affecting themselves. At sea they are too much engaged with their duties, and separated into too small parties to get up public meetings, and pass resolutions or petitions; and in the few brief intervals which they enjoy on shore, they are too much under the influence of those short-lived pleasures, which their previous state of privation makes them relish with more intensity than other men, to give their thoughts to any thing but the impulse of the moment, while they have no organization, no leaders, and are destitute therefore of all the elements of a deliberative or a petitioning body. And yet, notwithstanding this, there have not been wanting instances in which the seamen of England have given expression to their feelings, in language not unbecoming any class of His Majesty's subjects. He would content himself with citing two instances only out of many that might be quoted. The first occasion was this: Soon after the accession of George III., in 1760, a Petition of the Mariners of England against Impressment, was presented to His Majesty, by the Duke of Cumberland, who began his career in the Navy, and who, on that account, was selected by the Seamen to carry their prayer to the foot of the throne. The other occasion was more recent, coming down indeed, to our own times. It was in a document emanating from the seamen of South Shields, that most extensive nursery for the British Navy, including the immense body of coasting mariners that sail from the Tyne and the Wear, which expressed their abhorrence of the system, and their prayer to be relieved from its oppressions.

He believed this to be the general feeling of the whole maritime body in every port of the kingdom; and if this feeling was not so frequently or so powerfully expressed as might be expected, it was to be ascribed chiefly to the two causes he had previously named; their isolated occupation at sea, and their frenzy of enjoyment on shore. (Hear, hear.)

But, it had been contended, and that too, by the right hon. baronet, the First Lord of the Admiralty, that Impressment was not only necessary, but that it was legal, and its legality defended by some of the highest authorities of the land. Supposing, however, that this were undeniable, it could furnish no good reason why a wrong that was sanctioned by law should not be abolished by law also; or why a custom that is more honoured in the breach than in the observance should not be wholly discontinued. If we looked a little closer into this matter, however, we should find that its legality had been asserted by only one authority of any note, and that a most doubtful one: while its illegality had been declared by many of the most eminent men of the kingdom. Lord Camden challenged the whole profession to prove the legality of Impressment; but no one undertook so odious a task. Lord Mansfield admitted that it had only usage in its defence: and judges and juries had repeatedly acquitted men under trial for murder, because they had justifiably resisted the invasion of their personal liberties by press-gangs. The great authority, however, on which the First Lord of the Admiralty relied, was Sir Michael Foster, the Recorder of Bristol; though a more unfortunate selection could hardly be made than of this subservient and promotion-seeking judge, who stands alone in the infamy of having laboured to defend a system, which all true lovers of rational and constitutional freedom cannot but regard with horror.

Judge Foster was Recorder of Bristol, at a time when an attempt having been made by a gang from the Mortar sloop to impress a seaman named Broadfoot, out of a merchant-ship in the Bristol channel, one of the press-gang, named Calahan, was killed by Broadfoot shooting him dead on the spot. The man who had committed the act of murder, as it was called, was tried for the offence before the Recorder at Bristol, on the 30th of April, 1743. In the course of the trial, it was proved that the press-warrant, by virtue and authority of which the attempt to impress the seaman was made, was not, at the time of the death, in the hands of the lieutenant to whom it was assigned, nor was the officer present—two omissions which were fatal, and the judge was accordingly compelled to direct the jury to acquit the prisoner of the wilful murder laid to his charge, as the act of slaying the individual who had made the attempt to seize him, without the necessary forms of the legal warrant or the presence of the officer, could not be considered as

murder, but merely manslaughter.—It was on this issue, however, that Foster took occasion to deliver in court a long argument in favour of the legality of Impressment, as established by usage, and being part of the King's prerogative, inherent in the Crown. This argument, or charge, he afterwards revised and published; and, as he no doubt anticipated, it proved so acceptable to the Government of that day, as to obtain for him very speedy professional promotion; for in less than two years afterwards, he was made one of the judges of the King's Bench. As a crown lawyer, and a warm advocate for the King's prerogative, he was undoubtedly a person of great repute; but on many occasions his views were so singular, that he often differed on various points from all the other judges of the court, and delivered his opinions against their judgments. As regards the argument or charge in question, "*The King versus Broadfoot*," it had never been considered by great constitutional lawyers, or by eminent liberal statesmen, as of any worth, and had rarely been referred to, except to prove the usage of Impressment as continuing through several successive reigns. Even Judge Foster, however, qualified his opinions by passages like these :

"The question is—Whether mariners, persons who have freely chosen a sea-faring life, persons whose education and employment have fitted them for the service, and inured them to it; whether such persons may not be legally pressed into the service of the Crown, *whenever the public service requires it*—*Ne quid detrimenti republica capiat!* For my part I think they may—I think the Crown hath a right to command the service of these people *whenever the public safety calls for it*;—the same right that it hath to require the personal service of *every man able to bear arms*, in case of a sudden invasion, or a formidable insurrection. The right in both cases is founded on one and the same principle: the necessity of the case, and the preservation of the whole. This personal service, in case of extreme necessity, is a principal branch of the allegiance which every subject of England owes to the Crown."

This is the language of Judge Foster; and who does not see, even in this, that it should be only in cases of sudden invasion—formidable insurrection—or moments of the greatest danger—that *every man capable of bearing arms* should be equally liable to the call upon his personal services; a maxim to which most persons would agree, if the emergency should arise, and the necessity be clearly proved. The error lies in this—that we take for the rule what should only be the exception. A standing army is held to be unconstitutional; and therefore we have an annual Mutiny Bill. The trial of civil offences by Courts Martial in Ireland, is clearly unconstitutional, and therefore we have a Coercion Bill. The Impressment of men for the Navy, except in times of imminent peril, should be declared equally illegal; and if an inevitable necessity should arise, it would be better to pass an Order in Council, as for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, or the establishment of a Censorship on the Press, to be repealed when the danger was over, than to let Impressment be considered to be the legal rule, and thus warrant resort to it at the discretion of any single captain, which is the case at all times abroad, and wherever there is a difficulty in getting men to enter at home; though with a well-organized system of a retaining pay for the navy, registering for the merchant seamen, and ballot for the maritime towns, no such cases of necessity ever could arise. (Hear, hear.)

It was said, during the debate on this subject in the last session, that Judge Foster's argument had never been answered: but, besides a host of minor writers, who undertook its refutation at the time of its appearance, the celebrated Benjamin Franklin entered the lists against him, and gave him a complete refutation. And although a First Lord of the Admiralty could not be expected to read every work on Impressment, it was certainly very remarkable that so celebrated a reply as that of Benjamin Franklin to the charge of Judge Foster should be unknown to the right hon. baronet.

So much then, for the authority of Mr. Justice Foster. But let us turn from so tainted a source as this, to the opinions of men not seeking preferment, by subserving to arbitrary power, and we shall be cheered by the contrast. The great Lord Chatham, in his speech on the occasion of Lord Pulteney's Bill for speedily



manning the Navy, in speaking of the recent practice of Impressment, condemned it in the strongest terms, as illegal, unconstitutional, and cruel. Lord Chatham also quoted the celebrated passage of Magna Charta, which says, "No free men shall be taken, or imprisoned, or outlawed, or exiled, but by lawful judgment of his peers, or of the law of the land." On which passage, the great Lord Coke had made the following commentary :

"No man shall be exiled, that is banished, or forced to depart, or stay out of England, without his consent. By the law of the land no man can be exiled, or banished out of his native country, but either by *authority of Parliament*, or in case of abjuration for felony, by the common law; and so when our books or our records speak of exile or banishment, other than in case of abjuration, it is intended to be done by the authority of Parliament, and therefore the King cannot send any subject of England against his will out of this realm, for that he should be an exile, and that he should *perdere patriam*. No, he cannot be sent against his will into Ireland, to serve the King or his Deputy there; because it is out of the realm of England; for if the King might send him out of this realm to any place, then under pretence of service as ambassador, or the like, he might send him into the farthest part of the world, which being an exile, is prohibited by this act."

And as it is a generally received opinion in law, that nothing less than one act of Parliament can repeal another, so, if Magna Charta stands unrepealed, then is the forcible impressment of seamen a direct violation of its provisions, and contrary to the law of the land.

Of cases in which the illegality of Impressment had been decided by verdicts of juries, it would be easy to cite many: but he would content himself with two only, the particulars of which he had become acquainted with in his recent visit to Hull, and to one of which an hon. member of this House (Mr. Pryme) had been an eye-witness. In both these cases the persons who had killed men belonging to the pressgang were acquitted of the charge of murder, on the ground that the power of Impressment was illegal, and might be therefore lawfully resisted. (Hear, hear.)

Let the house observe then, the position in which such verdicts as these placed both parties in the transaction. It had been well said that it is an incontrovertible maxim in all oppositions, that one side must be right, and, vice versa, one wrong. But, according to every authority, the nature of a press-warrant is such, that if the lieutenant of the gang, in the attempt of pressing a man, were to commit murder, he would not be amenable to justice, but would be acquitted from having done it *ex officio*: and on the other hand, if any one whom they were attempting to press, were likewise to be guilty of that crime, neither would he be liable to punishment, but would have an acquittal upon the plea of self defence. Strange contradiction, when murder on either side is palliable! This at once sets the injustice of press-warrants in the strongest light; they are either right or wrong: if the former, no man that comes within their tenure can by law resist them, and undoubtedly would (if murder were the consequence of such resistance) be open to the extremest rigour of the law, as much so as if he were to kill a constable, or any other peace-officer, in the execution of his duty. On the other hand, if they are unsupported by law, if they have nothing to justify them but the absurd plea of custom, they are in every respect unwarrantable, and the officers who execute them have no justification for the violence they too frequently make use of, but are liable and ought to be brought to condign punishment. (Hear, hear.)

It was high time that such a state of things as this should cease, and give place to some more settled and defined law on the subject: and all that was wanted to effect this was that the Committee he asked for should be granted, and the subject investigated with that care and attention which should prepare a substitute for the practice he sought to abolish: and preserve at the same time the rights of private liberty and the interests of the public service. (Hear, hear.)

The inefficiency and expensiveness of Impressment, as compared with voluntary service, were topics, however, that required to be touched on as well as its cruelty and illegality; and if he could establish these points in addition to the

former, he thought the grounds on which he should ask the support of the house would be irresistible. So long ago as the time of Sir Robert Walpole, the utter inadequacy of Impressment to secure the full supply of proper men had been forcibly dwelt on, and from that hour to the present, the difficulties of obtaining the number and kind of men required, had been a constant theme of complaint. Indeed, a moment's reflection must satisfy any one, that the agency of a press-gang, at the very name of which men fly with terror from the ports where they are, into all the surrounding country, to escape being seized, must be a most inefficient instrument, when the object is to draw and attract all the scattered seamen of the kingdom to the principal ports where they are required. It might be safely assumed, that of 20,000 seamen which might be present in the harbours of England, at the breaking out of a war, 19,000 might be obtained for the navy as volunteers by adequate pay, limited service, and kind treatment; while the effect of attempting to seize them by press-gangs would be, that 1000 might be secured by the first sweep of the ships and taverns; but that 19,000 would escape, and either remain in their hiding places till the impress had subsided, or go off concealed in the holds of merchant vessels, while foreigners navigated them, to swell the navy of France, or Russia or America, and take up arms against their native land, as had been notoriously the case in past time, and as would be repeated again should Impressment ever be attempted to be revived. In consequence, then, of the impossibility of securing by Impressment, the full number of the best seamen required for the fleet, men of an inferior description were taken, and when these were exhausted, landsmen were impressed, jails and prison-ships were emptied of their criminal inmates, and heterogenous assemblages of all manner of men were thus congregated together, who could only be kept in order by a severity of discipline which would be wholly unnecessary in any voluntary service; and which, besides, endangered the safety of the ship and crew in moments of peril, whether in the face of an enemy, or amid the dangers of a lee shore. (Hear, hear.)

Admiral Patten asserts that he was enabled, from his official situation, as one of the Lords of the Admiralty, to ascertain the fact, that the total number who deserted from the service in the last war, in the short space of twenty-five months, from May, 1803, to June 1805, and that too, notwithstanding the utmost vigilance exercised to prevent it, was no less than 15,000 men. Lord Nelson, in an interesting paper presented by him to Earl St. Vincent, in February, 1803, on the evils of Impressment, and the best mode of manning the Navy, calculates the cost of procuring the men by Impressment, at 20*l.* a head, on the average; and says that 42,000 so impressed, deserted during the last war, making a loss of 840,000*l.* to the nation, besides the cost of supplying their places by others. He asserts that there was then scarcely a fleet of merchant ships that left England which did not carry off at least 1,000 deserters from the Navy concealed in their holds: and all these of course went to replenish the navies of other powers, but especially American, many of whose crack ships were manned, disciplined, and fought by the skill and valour of British seamen, while the ships of the English navy were left with skeleton crews of the most wretched kind and description. (Hear, hear.)

Admiral Ekins gives some account of the number of our seamen who were serving in the American ships, and says, that Commodore Decatur declared, after taking the Macedonian, that he had not a seaman in his ship who had not served from five to twelve years in the British Navy. He added, that two of their guns were named 'Nelson' and 'Victory;' and to the former it was the exclusive privilege of men who had been *bargemen* of the British Admiral to be quartered!

Now, in the event of a war with any of the maritime powers of Europe, should Impressment not be previously abolished, there can be no doubt that our seamen, driven by the terrors of the press-gangs from our own shores, will escape as speedily as they can to America, and enter into their merchant or naval service. Impressment on shore will be useless after the first day, as the men will have hidden themselves or flown; and Impressment afloat, from those American vessels to which our seamen may flee for safety, will be resisted by the Americans to the death; so that we shall be shut out from both these sources, and be

obliged to depend on voluntary entry, for bounties or increase of pay, after all. The system then was not merely cruel, but altogether inefficient, not answering even the end proposed, namely the speedy manning the fleet, the necessity for doing which effectively on a sudden, was the chief plea for retaining this terrific power. (Hear, hear.)

But it appeared that it was not only on sudden occasions, but even in periods of profound peace, that Impressment was resorted to. Not more than two days ago he had received a letter from a gentleman at Liverpool, which stated this fact; and as the letter was so recent and so well authenticated, he would venture to read a portion of it to the House. The writer said :

"In the autumn of 1832, the Government ordered the equipment of a fleet of vessels, which were sent to the Scheldt to watch over the movements of the Dutch. To man this fleet, impressment was had recourse to in the Thames, and through private information I learnt that the Admiralty had ordered a vessel round to Liverpool for the same purpose. To prevent the completion of their design, I immediately wrote to the Admiralty, and offered to procure 1000 able seamen, without a bounty, for his Majesty's service within one month, provided they would give to the men, as is customary with merchants of this port, an advance of two or three months' pay. A vessel, the *May Flower* cutter, Lieutenant Morgan, commander, came round to Liverpool with forty-five men, an acknowledged press gang; but I need scarcely add, that no impressment was attempted. Mr. Barrow acknowledged the receipt of my offer, and said he was commanded to thank me in the name of the Admiralty, and to say that a sufficient number of men had been procured. The cutter was in the Mersey about a fortnight, during which time she got about twenty volunteers. There were, to my knowledge at the time, many hundreds of seamen, who wanted to ship themselves, and the finest men in the port could at that, or at any other time, be procured at a bounty of 4 or 5*l.* per man."

It could scarcely be necessary, he thought, that he should trouble the house further on this point. If the object of Impressment were to secure a full supply, not merely of the requisite numbers but also the best description of men for the King's navy, then had it utterly and entirely failed; for its effect had hitherto been, to frighten and to force from our own shores some of the best and bravest of our seamen, who went to strengthen and improve the navies of other countries—to leave our merchant ships to be navigated almost wholly by foreign seamen in time of war; and to cause our naval ships to be manned by the sweepings of the brothels, the outpourings of the jails, and the rejected and condemned outcasts of society, who could only be kept in order by a system of torture and terror, instead of their being, as undoubtedly they might be made, under a better system, homes of comfort and protection, as well as bulwarks of safety and defence. (Hear.)

The house would now expect him to show what remedy could be applied to such an evil as this; and what mode of obtaining men he would recommend in lieu of the present. His answer would be, that we should act exactly in the same principle as had guided us in the Abolition of Slavery. In that house, during the last session, it had been triumphantly shown, that the Negroes of the West Indies, being human beings like ourselves, were animated by hopes and fears like us, and having a love of pleasure and a hatred of pain, they were capable of being swayed by the same motives as other human beings to seek the one and avoid the other. The question with respect to their condition, was comprised in these few words, "wages or the whip." The latter had been tried, and found ineffectual. The former was therefore determined to be the proper stimulus to draw forth their willing and efficient services. It was exactly the same with the seamen of Britain. The handcuff of the press-gang, and the lash of the boatswain's mate had each been tried, and the effect of both was to inspire hatred of the service and frequent desertion. Let adequate wages and limited service, free agency and honourable treatment, be tried; and there would be no more difficulty in getting men for the navy than for any other service in which human hands are required. (Hear, hear, hear.)

On a former occasion, he had entered into minute details, explanatory of the

plan he would propose as a remedy or substitute for Impressment. But as his present motion was not, like the former one, declaratory of any opinion as to Impressment, but merely for a Committee to consider of the practicability of doing away with the forced service, and substituting some mode of voluntary entry instead, he should content himself with briefly enumerating the three leading principles on which the plan he suggested was founded, and in the justice of which the first Lord of the Admiralty then concurred, as he doubted not the whole house would now do. The three principles were these :

The first principle of it should be to encourage the entry, education, and protection of seamen, in the fishing, coasting, and mercantile vessels of the country ; so that no new levies, or unskilled hands, should ever get their first training in a ship of war, but be previously initiated and well seasoned to the hardships and duties of their enterprising profession, in those nurseries already named.

The second principle of any such system should be that of rendering the naval service as attractive as possible, and making it the interest of men to seek for employment in His Majesty's ships, rather than in any other class of vessels.

The third principle should be that of progressive advancement in honour and emolument in proportion to the length or the importance of the duties performed, so as not merely to draw men originally into the service, by the attraction of adequate wages, kind treatment, and a reasonable enjoyment of liberty, but also to attach them to the service for ever afterwards, by making their interest and their duty to go hand in hand together, and inspiring them with feelings of honourable pride in a rank obtained by length and value of time devoted to the defence of their country's liberty and honour. (Hear, hear.)

On these he would ground a system of registration that should include every individual obtaining his livelihood on the seas, or coming within the fair description of a maritime or seafaring person ; and exempting them from all liability to serve in the army or militia, procure out of their body, by a system of voluntary entry, and fair routine of equal liability to service afloat in turn, any number of thorough bred, able, and enterprising seamen, that His Majesty's service could at any time require ; the details of which system he should be prepared to state fully to the Committee, under whose province it would properly fall, to consider of their practicability, and report their opinion thereon to the House. As some prejudices and misconceptions, however, existed, with respect to a system of registry, which, it was contended, had been tried and failed, a brief explanation of the history of that experiment might be permitted to him.

There was an act passed in 1696, in the reign of William III. for the Registry of Seamen, which has often been described as tyrannical and oppressive, though it was wholly voluntary, and authorized no coercion whatever. The seamen of that day, however, would not enter themselves in such registry : first, because there being no legislative provision for the abolition of Impressment, they regarded it as a decoy to induce them to enter themselves for the purpose of assisting towards their own seizure, if their services should be needed ; and secondly, from the deeprooted aversion they then had to the naval service, in which all manner of abuses prevailed. Ralph, in his History of England, states, that in 1693, Queen Anne, after prevailing on the sailors to man the fleet, by the most solemn promise, that their wages should be paid up to a certain period before they sailed, totally neglected the fulfilment of her pledge : for, by accounts laid before the House of Commons, at that time, it was shown that no less a sum than 1,036,415*l.* was due to the fleet for arrears of pay ; and so great, he says, was the discontent among them, from this arrear of their pay, bad provisions, and cruel usage, that the most severe discipline, nay even death itself, (for many of them were hanged for desertion, and some even for *demanding their wages*, which was called *Mutiny*) could not prevent its breaking out.

In 1706, however, a new mode was tried of compulsory registry, under the most odious and oppressive provisions. The act was passed through Parliament in four days. It authorized the levying of 20,000 men ; and it empowered magistrates to hunt out seamen wherever they could be found. Twenty shillings a-head were to be given to constables for apprehending them ; and if they de-

sorted after being delivered over to the officer, they were to be deemed guilty of felony. As an encouragement to dishonest men to join the royal standard, all insolvent debtors who entered to serve in the fleet were to be released from their imprisonment and liabilities. The enforcement of this act was found impossible to be continued with any effect; for though every means were tried to hunt out and seize the seamen, they secreted themselves in all manner of hiding places, and the people on shore gave them ready shelter, till at length, in despair of manning the fleet by such means, the act was repealed, on the very ground that it had been found oppressive, expensive, and wholly inexpedient. It was about this period, too, that piracy in the East Indies, and buccaneering in the West Indies, was so prevalent; and it is now matter of certainty that this horrid system of forcible Impressment, ill-usage, and excessive cruelty at home, drove the best and bravest of our seamen abroad, who, being unable to gain a honest livelihood in the peaceable pursuit of their profession, manned and fought some of the finest vessels that ever swam the seas, and performed prodigies of valour, accompanied by mercy in many instances towards their captives, bespeaking the noble and generous natures of the men themselves, which, under kind treatment and a liberal system of inducement and rewards, would have made thousands of them useful and honourable defenders of their native land. (Hear.)

Let the house assist him then in his endeavours to prevent a recurrence of all these evils, by the abolition of that cruel practice which had been so fruitful a source of misery and crime. If the difficulty of finding a substitute were alleged, he would say that a nation which should have the hardihood to attempt to govern an empire of a hundred millions of conquered subjects at a distance of ten thousand miles, and yet shrink from undertaking to devise a plan for organizing a hundred thousand seamen, for the supply of our navy at home, must have a strange conception of its own strength and weakness. If the expense of paying bounties and adequate wages formed the principal obstacle, he would point to the grant of twenty millions for the abolition of slavery; and contend that the abolition of Impressment ought to be an object fully as dear to us as that. And if the King's prerogative, or immemorial usage, were pleaded in objection, he would point to the annihilation of ancient boroughs, with their royal charters, and vested rights, to the reform of municipal corporations, whether given by royal charter or otherwise, and to the generally recognized doctrine, that to the great and paramount consideration of the happiness of the people, all privilege, prerogative, and custom must be made to give way. He would leave the subject, therefore, in the hands of the Commons of England, the most appropriate protectors of the rights and liberties of all classes of His Majesty's subjects: in the full assurance, that the seamen of Britain, the brave and generous defenders of their country from all foreign aggressors, who wielded the thunders of the British Navy on every hostile shore—and who manned those floating bulwarks to which we looked as the guardians of our sea-girt home—would receive at their hands, the justice of which they had so long been deprived. (Hear.) They desired not to be placed *above* any other class of the King's subjects. But they had determined that they would no longer submit to be placed *below* them all; and the world at large would concede to them the justice of their demand; when they simply asked, before they took up arms and shed their blood in the defence of their country's liberties, that that country should no longer sanction a violation of their own. (Hear.) If they were to fight the battles of freedom, it was necessary that they should themselves be free; and in the progress of improvement and reform, though they were content to be the last of all the classes emancipated from their chains, yet they could not endure their galling pressure longer; and demanded, before they lifted up the arm which they held ever ready to strike down their country's foe, that that arm should be unmanacled, unfettered, and completely free; as they would then be best enabled to protect the liberties of others, when they had been taught to preserve and respect their own.

He begged leave, therefore, to move, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the practicability of devising some plan, by which His Majesty's navy may be manned in time of war, without recourse to the practice of forcible Impressment." (Mr. Buckingham resumed his seat amidst great cheering, which lasted for several minutes.)

Mr. G. F. Young said he rose, with a deal of pleasure, to second the motion. He had hoped that the necessity for bringing it forward would have been superseded by the concession of the right hon. baronet at the head of the Admiralty, for he was sure the right hon. gentleman could not have forgotten the unequivocal expression of feeling on the subject in that house, when it was last under discussion. This hope had been greatly encouraged from the new regulation which it was proposed to adopt, of discharging five hundred men from the navy, and rearing one thousand boys; and from the bill introduced by the Government, to do away with service in the navy as a punishment for the crime of smuggling, thus enhancing the character of the service, and holding out inducements to men voluntarily to enter it. (Hear, hear.) Impressment had been upheld on the ground of necessity (that had been hitherto the only plea for its continuance), but he, for one, denied that necessity existed. At all events, this plea of necessity had never been made out, and as was well known, both Lord Camden and Lord Mansfield doubted it. It had been asserted that the sailors were themselves quite indifferent on the subject; in answer to which he would refer to the petition he had the honour that day of presenting to the house, from 805 sailors of North Shields, and the strong terms of reprobation which they used as to the system of impressment. As a proof, too, of the progressive advance which they were making in civilization, he begged to state, that out of the 805 subscribers to the petition, there were only thirty who made that mark which proved them to be incapable of writing. He trusted the time was fast approaching when the British sailors would be released from this cruel and degrading system—when proper inducements to voluntary enlistment would be employed—when promotion would be by merit (hear, hear), and when prize money would be more equally distributed. He believed it would be impossible to continue the system of impressment, that, indeed, it would be openly and generally resisted. A case for inquiry had certainly been established, and he could only repeat his expression of regret that the Government had not thought fit to grant the committee which had been so ably called for. (Hear, hear.)

Sir JAMES GRAHAM, said that he should have appealed to the courtesy of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Buckingham) to postpone his motion, could he with propriety have done so. But he was bound to say it would not be consistent with his duty to make such a request, because, by postponing it, the motion hereafter might not have that full hearing, and that calm and dispassionate discussion, which its high importance demanded, and which it was necessary for the best interests of the country should be conceded to it. Therefore, he was anxious on the grounds stated—and more especially from a regard for the great maritime interest—to come to a calm deliberation of the subject. For the point of prerogative, he could assure the hon. member for Sheffield, that if by its maintenance he did not think he was acting for the efficiency of the service, and the good of the whole realm, he for one would never attempt to defend it. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman had appealed to Ministers to grant this committee, on the ground that by so doing they should add to their reputation, and obtain a considerable increase of popular favour. Now he could assure the hon. member, that no men in the world were more sensible of the vast services rendered to them by the popular favour they had enjoyed; but on the other hand, he must be permitted to say, that the desire of popular applause, however grateful it might be, would never shake their firmness of purpose if they thought they were right, or induce them to swerve for one moment from the strict line of their public duty. (Hear, hear.) Therefore in this as in every other instance, they should not do anything in the hope, or with the intention of obtaining popular favour; but their conduct would be guided by the sole consideration of what was best calculated to ensure the safety, and increase the general interest of the State. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Buckingham) stated that since he had brought forward his motion, he had had many opportunities of acquiring valuable information on the subject from the sea-faring men at the out-ports, and in the north of England. He (Sir James) certainly must say that the hon. gentleman had brought this motion forward in a manner which was unexceptionable. (Hear, hear.) He could not but admire the talent which he had displayed, and the temper with which the hon. gentleman had discussed the question. (Cheers.) On a subject such as impressment, where declamation might almost naturally be indulged in, and when the feelings could easily be excited, he thought it showed no common judgment in an hon. member to state his points in so fair, so dispassionate, and so

argumentative a manner, as he was sure the house would agree with him, had been done that evening. (Loud cheers.) He regretted to have seen speeches attributed to the hon. gentleman, which were of a very different character, and which, from having been delivered at the out-ports, might have caused unpleasant feelings. He was bound to say, however, that a full atonement had that evening been made. He was convinced that the course which the hon. member proposed, that of referring the subject to a committee, could not either with safety or advantage be taken. Were his opinion not so, he for one would not resist the motion. The hon. member asked if the house was not competent to decide upon the question. He (Sir James) was the last person to deny the competency of the house on this or any other subject; but would merely ask, whether they would not have a better chance of coming to some practicable results, by leaving the question to be introduced to the house in some way or other by the responsible advisers of the Crown, when the whole subject might, in the different stages, be completely and effectually considered in detail. (Hear.) The hon. member, in the course of his remarks, had thought fit to institute a comparison between impressment and slavery; but this, in his (Sir James's) opinion, would not at all hold good; for the great blot of slavery was, that it enforced labour without remuneration (No!) Now, in the naval service, there were ample facilities afforded to sailors to provide for their families, and they received wages regularly. The hon. gentleman had next argued that, though the sailors had not petitioned on this subject, their silence was not to be construed into any thing like indifference, as they had not the opportunities of meeting which other classes enjoyed. It was necessary the points should be met, and met fairly. There was once an opportunity, when the seaman had the power of exercising the right of petition—a moment of great national distress, which was too memorable in English history for any man to be ignorant of—and what did their petition set forth? On that occasion, in a list of eight or ten grievances, impressment was not even mentioned. (Hear, hear.)

On the point of prerogative, they had evidence, not merely of the prescriptive right of the Crown as to impressment, but that that right was sanctioned by statute, and had been so frequently from the reign of William the Third down to the present day. But if on this point there was any doubt in the mind of the hon. mover, how much more preferable would it be (instead of the course now proposed) for the hon. gentleman, on his own responsibility, to introduce a declaratory bill, and to settle the question at once. Leaving matters of opinion, the hon. gentleman had approached matters of fact, asserting that in a time of profound peace impressment had been exercised. His (Sir James Graham's) astonishment was certainly great when he heard this; but his amazement was considerably increased when he heard the hon. gentleman specify the actual time when such an instance occurred. Yes, the hon. gentleman had gone into minute details, and actually brought the eyes of the house to the very year he alleged such impressment had taken place. He (Sir James Graham) again repeated, that he heard that statement with the utmost astonishment. It was the only instance adduced by the hon. gentleman, yet how was it borne out by facts? He asserted that press warrants were issued in 1832, during the period of the embargo on Dutch vessels; that seamen were impressed, and that vessels were sent round from Liverpool to take out the men. The hon. gentlemen must have been strangely misinformed. What he had stated was not the fact. (Hear, hear.) No press warrants were issued since the conclusion of the war in 1815, and no difficulty had at all arisen in 1832 of obtaining the necessary complement of men. (Hear, hear.) A vessel, it was quite true, was sent round to Liverpool, but her destination there was to receive volunteers who were most anxious to enter under the British flag. (Shouts of hear, hear, in which Mr. Sheil's voice was particularly distinguished.) He (Sir James Graham) well understood the cheer of the hon. member for Tipperary, and what he thought he could convey by that expression of his feelings. He considered the willingness of those men to serve his Majesty, might be adduced as an argument against his positions, and, therefore, that the question could be at once disposed of. The hon. gentleman could not correctly arrive at such a conclusion. The time should be taken into account, and the peculiar nature of the duty which it was considered the fleet would then have had to discharge. If the hon. gentleman had reflected on this, perhaps his opinion might have undergone some change. (Hear.) He (Sir James Graham) was far from being friendly to the system of impressment, and considered it should never be resorted to, excepting in cases of extreme and urgent necessity—times of peril, moments of danger, when every consideration should bend to the imperative call of the country's interest. (Hear, hear.) He felt that the king's service ought to be made as attractive and as comfortable as it could allow for seamen. This could be only done by an adhesion to

three points, that ought never to be departed from, namely : first, to hold out encouragement to merchant seamen to enter the Royal Navy ; secondly, by good treatment when on board ; and, thirdly, by conferring promotion on zealous and efficient services. Provision for age should also be recollected, in order that he who had passed the best days of his life in an arduous service, might be sure of at least a protection from want in the decay and helplessness of old age. (Hear, hear).

Having gone thus far, he would now proceed to state what had been done since 1815, to carry the views of the hon. member for Sheffield into operation. First, as to the wages of seamen, he would for a moment recall the attention of the house to the altered value of money, which had materially increased the pay of the sailor ; added to which, the pay was nominally enlarged in 1825 ; indeed so much so, that at present there is not more than one-eighth difference between the wages in the king's and merchant's service, and when the superior quality of the provisions were considered, they might be then said to be fairly equalized. The King's sixpence was allotted so as to benefit the sailor ; and the profit of the purser, which was formerly at the expence of the sailor, was now reduced so much as only to allow the country not suffering by the sale of provisions below the wonted standard of value. The scale of pensions had been likewise increased, and at the present moment the regulation was, that a man, after 20 years service, was entitled to the allowance of 10*d*. a day ; or if he had lost a limb, or his health was injured in the service, no matter the time employed, he had the same allowance. (Hear). Thus far the measures of amelioration up to the period of the last debate in that house. He should now proceed to detail what had been done since that period, to render the King's service more acceptable to seafaring-men. A complaint had often been made, and before the time to which he was desirous to direct the attention of the house, not sufficiently attended to, and which was found to have been productive of the greatest personal inconvenience. A vessel might be on a foreign station for two or three years, and during that service the seaman had not the power to draw any portion of his wages. A former Board had, indeed, allowed 4*s*. per month, but that was not sufficient : every luxury might be around, yet the sailor, although 50*l*. perhaps were due to him by the country, could not satisfy his wishes or his wants. An arrangement had been just made by which the sailor would be permitted to draw 1*l*. per month, which would not interfere with the wholesome practice of enabling his family to draw that sum at home necessary for their support in his absence. The sailors formerly were objects of high consideration with the country, but in thinking of them the absent father or husband was not forgotten (hear). The distribution of prize money had also been placed upon a better footing. At former periods prizes were so disposed of in the navy, that letters of marque were allowed, and the privateer service became so popular, that the decks of its vessels never failed to be adequately and sufficiently manned. (Hear.) A proclamation had been recently issued by his Majesty, granting a new scale of prize money (hear !), which could not fail to be recognized as most just and encouraging. For every 50,000*l*. taken, the seaman's former share was 5*l*., at present it would be 15*l*. (Hear, hear !). This increase would not be made by deducting from the other ranks in the navy, but from a reduction in the allowance to the Admiralty (Hear, hear !). The custom of sending smugglers to serve in the navy for five years, as a punishment for the offence, had been justly denounced. It was converting the King's vessels into prison ships. It was a stain that could not be too soon removed (hear !). Another plan was to induce boys of good character to enter the service, to place them under the pennant with fair hopes of their future advancement and benefit to their country. 1,000 lads had already entered ; and however the service might be dispraised, it promised most fairly for them. He could assure the house every attention that could be paid was given the subject by his Majesty's Ministers. It had occupied their patient and most serious inquiry ; they duly considered its importance ; and their great desire was, that such a mighty arm of our strength should be strengthened, not paralysed ; worthy of the body with which it was connected—worthy of the country it was destined to defend. If the subject was left in the hands of Ministers, hon. members might rest satisfied that those progressive improvements would take place which the hon. member for Sheffield was so desirous to further.

He (Sir James Graham) was likewise anxious that the merchant service—that nursery which cradled our seamen—that school in which they were taught their first and most useful lessons—should also have that attention paid to it which its value and its present state so urgently required. During the recess, it had occupied his undivided attention, and he had prepared a bill to consolidate the different laws relating to the merchant service, and to effect a more complete registration through-



out the kingdom. That bill was then ready. (Hear, hear). From its operations, if it became law, he looked for the best results. The name of Nelson had been introduced into the speech of the hon. member for Sheffield, and his great authority quoted as opposed to impressment. Any thing uttered by that illustrious character must of course have great weight, and be heard with almost reverential attention. It so happened, however, that he (Sir James Graham) had the advantage of hearing from a distinguished officer, who had enjoyed a large share of Lord Nelson's confidence, a far different version of his lordship's sentiments. He alluded to Sir Thomas Hardy. Lord Nelson had indeed regretted the stern necessity of impressment, but considered the navy could not be manned without having recourse to its repulsive laws. He felt, however, that by proper regulations, the necessity might be considerably lessened. Those regulations Ministers wished to see adopted. (Hear, hear). By the bill, which he had proposed, every seafaring man would be compelled to have a certificate, and if found wanting, such compulsory service should be the penalty. One difficulty certainly presented itself, of which he did not then see the means of extrication. He alluded to the case of sailors on foreign stations, but that would be of course subject for after-consideration. If all means failed, the power of impressment should be held in reserve; it ought not lightly to be dispensed with. The house which he then had the honour to address was a deliberative assembly; they were not, he trusted, to be moved, unless ample cause were shown; they would not unreflectingly do that which might render less efficient a service to which the empire could so proudly refer. The hon. mover had spoken of the non-effectiveness of the navy in consequence of impressment. He would, in answer, refer to Camperdown, St. Vincent, the Nile, and Trafalgar. (Hear, hear.) The men who had fought and conquered in those battles were impressed. (Hear, hear.) What, then, became of the hon. member's assertion? The fact he (Sir James Graham) had stated could not be disputed; it spoke in a language not to be misunderstood. He should again call upon the House to pause, to weigh well the decision they intended coming to that evening; upon it much depended. If they once denounced impressment, it would be impossible afterwards to recall their vote, their resolution could not be rescinded. And should impressment afterwards be found necessary, with what face could they proceed? Without going into the inquiry sought for before a Select Committee, let them permit a responsible Minister of the Crown to introduce a measure of six months' preparation—a measure which he felt assured would be found to work well. He had been told so, and he gave every credence to the source from whence he had derived his information. (Hear, hear.)

The heads of the intended bill were, first, to give facilities to parishes to apprentice youths; those facilities they then had in respect to the mercantile, but the bill provided they should be extended to the Royal Navy. Secondly, that rules should be established for keeping up a complete registration; thirdly, that indulgence and protection should be afforded to seamen in the merchant service, and that means should be within their reach of obtaining their wages; and fourthly, which was of paramount importance, the condemning of a practice which was more than of rare occurrence—he alluded to the custom of masters leaving their men on foreign shores, to the evident prejudice of the country; for the men thus deserted by him who should be their protector, frequently entered the service of the State on which they were thrown, or, more frequently, became pirates. These were the points which his bill intended to carry into effect; and, after Easter, he was willing to send it up to a Committee, if such were in accordance with the wishes of the house. (Hear, hear.) All inconveniences would thus be obviated, and there would be no danger of unduly interfering with a service, on the efficiency of which depended the safety, honour, and the independence of their common country. (Cheers.) The Right Honourable Baronet concluded by proposing an amendment for leave to bring in a bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to merchant seamen, and to keep up a more effectual registration of seafaring men.

Mr. ROBINSON, having presented a petition yesterday on the subject then before the house, trusted for its indulgence for a few moments, while he remarked upon what he considered a discrepancy between the right hon. the First Lord of the Admiralty's words, and the decision he had announced his intention of arriving at. The speech of the right hon. gentleman perfectly concurred in the views of the hon. member for Sheffield; and if the committee were granted, which he trusted, and was sure the house would grant, he had no doubt most valuable information would be received from the right hon. gentleman. That right hon. gentleman had asked that measures for the amelioration of the British seamen should be left in his department. He had every confidence in the First Lord of the Admiralty, and if he did

not consider that it were inexpedient and unjust that such a responsibility should be vested in the hands of one individual, he should not consider the request unreasonable, or one that ought not to be conceded. He felt however, the subject was one for parliament, and before parliament it ought to be discussed. The house had been asked with an air of triumph, if they would do away with impressment in cases of great emergency? He (Mr. Robinson) had had some experience, and he was free to state, that in cases of great emergency he was willing to allow matters to remain in the same state they were at present. But that was no reason the system should not be modified. Every officer had the power to act as he pleased, and frequently he acted from caprice. He did not, however, mean to reflect on that honourable profession; but still that power had frequently been exercised most harshly—most tyrannically. True, there was not so much danger for the future, still the house ought not to permit matters to proceed as they had done. Suppose a war broke out, if the law was not changed, would not the identical harsh measures complained of be again resorted to? The house was called upon to pause; yes, indeed, it ought to pause before it permitted even the possibility of the recurrence of a state of things that could not be too much deprecated. Much had been said of the improvement in the condition of the seamen, but unless the inquiry sought for was complied with, the service would never become a favourite with seamen. It was said that the pay had been equalised between the royal and mercantile navy; it was true; but then let it be recollected that they were then in a time of profound peace, and that should a war break out, the wages of merchant seamen would be increased from 4*l.* to 5*l.* a month. Hence the difficulty of obtaining an adequate force. After seamen were impressed, much time must elapse before they can be regarded with that confidence which leaves the commander at perfect ease. Officers are compelled to have recourse to measures of extreme severity. He remembered once being on board a man-of-war, when the captain had an impressed crew. He considered they were mutinous, and to prevent them going on shore, an order was issued prohibiting any sailor of the fleet to land. (Hear, hear!) Sir James Graham's plan did not militate against that of the hon. member for Sheffield. Hoping, then, that the motion would not be superseded by the amendment—hoping that the fullest enquiry would be granted—and hoping that merchants in time of war would not have to man their vessels from holes and corners—for the honour of the service, and the dignity of the country, he should vote for the original motion.

Sir EDWARD CODRINGTON was not desirous to wrest any prerogative from his Majesty, but he only required that seamen should be placed on the same footing as other classes of the King's subjects. He recollected an instance of one seaman who had been impressed, and who had served with him afterwards for the period of nine years. At the end of that period he asked for his discharge, and from the length and nature of his services he was fully entitled to it, but the man's application was refused and he did not get it. The difficulties in the way of impressed sailors to obtain their discharge were great. Besides, sailors in the royal navy did not obtain wages equal to their merits, and they were not encouraged to enter the service by receiving bounty, as soldiers did for engaging in the land service. It was his decided opinion that if seamen were fairly treated they would enter the royal navy in preference to engaging in the merchant service, and it would not happen that they would refuse the royal service if they were well treated, and received proper indulgencies. The bad treatment they had received was in a great measure the consequence of the system of impressment. In the merchant service, seamen underwent double the labour they did in the navy, but then they were more kindly treated, they were allowed to go on shore, and to communicate with their families, whilst in the royal navy those indulgencies were not extended to them. He remembered that at the battle of Trafalgar he had in his ship an excellent sailor, an American, who was a pressed man. This man had been pressed into the Terrible: in order to get home to his country, he went to the West Indies in an English ship as an Englishman; he was there pressed again, came back to England, and was eventually sent to him. This man said that he would be glad to remain in the English navy, but that he had a wife and family in America with whom he could not communicate because he had been impressed. The truth was, that in consequence of the odium attendant on the system of impressment in the eyes of foreigners, it was difficult to get them to have any thing to do with the service.

There was another evil attendant on this system, namely, that a bad set of fellows were often picked up and sent among the fleet. He would mention an instance in which twenty-seven fellows picked up in London had been forced upon him. He would rather not have had anything to do with them, for he was sure they would demoralize his men, and he was very glad to find a way of getting rid of them. They

were only looking for an opportunity, and the very first one they had they profited by. One fine day they manned the boats, and every one of them ran away. (Laughter.) The house might believe that he was not very sorry for their desertion. With respect to the way sailors used to be paid, he always objected to the power of paying them in paper money. In consequence of their being paid with paper money, they received 6s. in the pound less than their due, and whenever that particular question should come fully before the house, he should claim for the whole navy 6s. in the pound as being still due to them on the whole amount of their wages. (Laughter and hear.) He begged to mention what occurred to him on this subject once when he was stationed off Gibraltar, where the men received in dollars 14s. for their pound of paper money. The men came upon the quarter deck, and asked him what was to be done? His answer was, that the thing could not be helped. So the men went away contented. But if he had told the men that, paying them in this way—with paper money—was a robbery on the part of the Government, it would have caused a mutiny in the fleet. (Hear and laughter.) Though he had men that had been pressed in his ship, he had never, himself, pressed men in his life; and he knew several instances of men returning on board ship from foreign countries, allowing themselves to be headed up in casks, and undergo other hard privations, rather than submit to impressment. It was a well known fact that during the war the sailors returning in fleets from the West Indies, the South Seas, and other parts, used, on their arrival off the coast of England, to be taken out of their ships, sent on board the Royal Navy, without having been allowed to touch the shore, or to communicate with their families, and that other men used to be put on board the returning trading vessels, to navigate them up the Thames. (Hear, hear.)

He hoped the house would allow him briefly to express his opinion on the subject of corporeal punishments. He granted that he once supported the principle in that house. What he meant to say by this was, that he objected to an alteration for the substitution of other species of punishment. He confessed that it was a painful and degrading thing that it should be imposed upon officers and gentlemen to see corporeal punishment carried into execution; but before it was changed, he should be glad to see some better substitute proposed. He recollected the instance of a marine, who, in order to avoid the infliction of a dozen lashes, committed a crime in order to be transported. He would repeat, that he should be glad to see some good substitute for corporeal punishment; and should be happy if any one could devise a mode of punishment that would be more pleasing and agreeable to soldiers and sailors. (Laughter.) They had no black holes on board ships, and there were many sorts of punishments suggested, that would be more strongly objected to, on the part of soldiers and sailors than the present mode. It was a common error to imagine that good men were punished—it was only the scum of the earth that were flogged (a laugh;) and for his own part, he would say, that every lash inflicted on the back of a good man, was twice as painful and as severe upon him as it was on the person punished. (Hear.) In consequence of impressment, so great was the desire of escape at the end of the war, that they were obliged to give up a proposed plan of using large pieces of cork on board, to prevent the sailors from being drowned. It was feared, if these pieces of cork were introduced, that the sailors would slip down on them, and use them as a means of escape. He believed that if they consented to the present motion, and went into committee, some mode might be devised to get rid of the odious system of Impressment. The Honourable and Gallant Admiral concluded by saying that he cordially supported the motion of the honourable member for Sheffield. (Hear, hear.)

Captain ELLIOTT rose to make a few observations on some errors that the hon. mover of the present question had fallen into on this occasion, as well as on a former occasion. He had now and then drawn an affecting picture of the miseries and sufferings consequent on the system of impressment; but, like every great artist, he had taken the liberty of over-colouring and exaggerating the picture. The hon. gentleman had brought forward two instances to prove that impressment was unjust, inefficient, and unnecessary. For his own part, he had commanded a ship from the breaking out of the war: and in consequence of the general system that then prevailed, it was impossible to keep ships manned without having recourse to impressment. Two officers had been mentioned, Lord Exmouth and the hon. and gallant member for Devonport, as never having employed pressed men.

Sir E. CODRINGTON.—I said I never myself impressed men; but that I had pressed men on board my vessel who had been sent to me by order of the Admiralty.

Captain ELLIOTT.—The nature of the hon. and gallant member's statement was such as to make the house believe that so little impressment was necessary, that

ships could be manned without having recourse to it. In referring to certain returns, he found that in the gallant Admiral's ship, for the space of four and a half years, the number of pressed men were seven, out of a crew of 614 men whom he had during that period. Now the question was, how many volunteers were to be found in that number? Only five; so that there were 609 men serving on board at forced service; without throwing himself upon other officers for relief, it was clear then that the crew of this ship could not be kept up to its full complement. He (Captain Elliott) never had recourse to other officers to keep up his crew complete. In the instance of Captain Pellew, whose ship had been first manned before the revolutionary war, every man was a volunteer, because it was before the first peace. Captain Pellew remained ten months in the ship he alluded to; she was completely manned by volunteers, and yet during those ten months there were no less than fifty-one desertions, being an average per annum, of a desertion for every third man and a half. He would quote another instance that related to the ship *Indefatigable*. On board her, half the crew was composed of volunteers, and the other half of men that had been impressed; and yet the average yearly desertion was only one man in nine. He would now come to a ship afterwards commanded for four years (as we understand by Captain Pellew also), and during that time only one in thirty deserted. These instances he considered sufficient proofs that impressment was not the cause of desertion; but that, on the contrary, in proportion to the number of men impressed on board, the number of deserters was reduced. For his own part, he confessed, however unpopular such an avowal might be, that, considering it a duty he owed to the service to keep the ship manned which had been entrusted to him by his King and his country, he had never hesitated, in order to keep her manned, to have recourse to impressment when he found it impossible to get volunteers; nor did he ever hesitate to employ corporeal punishment when it was found necessary for the good discipline of his ship. From April, 1807, to December, 1812, the total number of desertions from 280 men he commanded was nine—being about an annual average of one desertion out of 171 men. Notwithstanding this, his ship was manned differently, and upon different principles, from the ships commanded by Captain Pellew; for Captain Pellew had in one ship 95 men forced into the service, he had them during ten months, and not quite that number of volunteers. In the next ship he had 340 men, which he got from the receiving ships; and in the third ship he had 126 men, also from the receiving ships, with 26 men that he was obliged himself to impress; making a total of 152 men forced into the service. He had no volunteers, since he was obliged afterwards to have recourse to impressment; and then, as he had before stated, the number of desertions among Captain Pellew's crews diminished. From these calculations, he (Captain Elliott) thought that he had fully proved to the house that desertion did not depend on impressment.

Though he was no advocate for Impressment for its own sake, he thought that Government would not be acting wisely if it gave up the power it had in this matter; and if it did, he felt confident that the merchant service would speedily feel itself injured by the abrogation of the system of Impressment. He could say, of his own experience, that he never knew the sailors, as a body, complain either of the power of Impressment or of corporeal punishment; what he heard them complain of was the abuse of these powers. With respect to the allusions that had been made to the mutiny at the *Nore*, the seamen there knew well enough that Impressment was in vogue, and they did not make it a chief cause of complaint. The grievances they then complained of had since been successfully remedied. The fact was, that Impressment, under some shape, existed in every country. If they went to America it would be found another thing (hear); at any rate it existed in all the old countries of Europe: it existed in Portugal; in Spain, for the Spanish mode of registration was little better than Impressment; it existed in Holland, or something very nearly the same, since men were there pressed for soldiers, and they had the option of serving in the navy or on land. (A laugh). Worse than our Impressment was the system adopted in Russia. He would not detain the house further, but merely put hon. members on their guard, lest they should deem him an advocate for Impressment. He should be extremely glad to see the navy manned by volunteers; but he feared that in cases of great emergency, in which in a short space of time it might be necessary to get together a numerous body of seamen, it would be difficult, nay, impossible to succeed without retaining the power of Impressment.

Colonel TORRENS was understood to express the opinion that impressment was a dormant power, which was very rarely used, and then only in cases of extreme emergency. He thought, therefore, that the crown might safely retain that power.

Mr. WARRE said, that if the motion of the hon. member for Sheffield had been met in a different manner from what it had been by the right hon. baronet (Sir James Graham), he should feel disposed to give it his most cordial support. However, under the present circumstances, and in consequence of the right hon. baronet's amendment, he thought it more advisable that the hon. member for Sheffield should withdraw his motion. A great change of opinion was daily taking place in men's minds, and he thought that in order to prevent this powerful engine breaking down, in case of emergency, it would be better to sift it thoroughly now that the country was in a state of profound peace. In consequence of what happened during that debate, he thought the most likely course by which they would see their object accomplished, would be to consent to the amendment of the right hon. baronet.

Mr. INGHAM begged to ask the right hon. baronet opposite, in reference to his proposed plan of registering seamen, whether it was his intention to introduce a clause into his bill, for the purpose of making it available to the Government to supply the navy with men by rotation, when sufficient men could not be got for the exigencies of the navy as volunteers? He also wished to know whether the service to be required of men in the merchant service was to be limited?

Sir JAMES GRAHAM was understood to say, that his proposed measure made no provision as to these points. The measure proposed by him was confined to the registration of seamen. What ultimate measures might be proposed would, in some measure, depend on the degree of success attending the registration. The experience of a century and a half showed the difficulty of such a scheme; but though he was aware of the difficulty, he was still in hopes that a plan might be discovered to answer the ends in view.

Admiral ADAMS said, that though the statement of the hon. member for Sheffield, had made a considerable impression upon him, he was still disposed to vote for the Amendment of the right hon. baronet, because he thought it would have the effect of accomplishing the object which the hon. member for Sheffield himself had in view, and that more safely and gradually than if his motion were agreed to.

Captain DUNDAS said that many impressed seamen now wore the same ribbon which the Speaker displayed upon his breast. (A laugh.)

Mr. LYALL thought that, in case of war, Impressment could not be dispensed with. In that case, money would not have the effect of bringing men into the Navy. Even in time of peace, the same prejudice existed in favour of the merchant service, because the men in it were comparatively free. In the merchant service a man was able, after a four or five months' voyage, to return to his family and friends; but in the Navy, men were separated from their families for five, six, or seven years, without the possibility of once seeing them. This was a sacrifice which no money could compensate, and money would therefore not be sufficient to induce men to enter the naval service.—Many eminent lawyers had given their opinion as to the legality of the practice. Among others, Wedderburn and Serjeant Glyn, two of the most eminent lawyers of their time, had said that Impressment was not only legal, but of immemorial usage.

Mr. HUME said, that when the question had formerly been before the house, he had always given it as his opinion that the pay in the Navy ought to be at least equal to that of merchantmen. He now repeated, that when merchantmen gave their seamen 5*l.* wages, the Navy should not give less. (Hear, hear, hear.) The Government admitted that it would be desirable to abolish Impressment, but said that there were objections to its abolition. Yet they opposed the motion for a Committee to inquire how these objections could be removed. (Hear, hear.) The Honourable and Gallant Secretary of the Admiralty opposite had boasted that the whole of the navy was manned by Impressment during the war; but, good God! were they not now, when in a state of profound peace, to take means to get such an evil removed (hear, hear). The right hon. baronet should have at once come forward and stated manfully whether he thought Impressment a subject fit to be inquired into or not; but instead of that, he stated that he had a measure in hand on the subject. This was a trick (No, no!)—a House of Commons' trick, which was only resorted to in seasons of difficulty. After the announcement of the registration, without the abolition of impressment, seamen would think that it was intended only as a net by which they might be the more easily caught. (Hear, hear.) He was ready to admit that, in case of emergency, the prerogative should remain with the Crown of impressing men into the service of the navy. But the question was, when that prerogative should be exercised; and he thought it the duty of the house so to guard and fence it round, that the prerogative should not fall

more heavily upon that meritorious class of persons, the merchant service, than upon others. He knew many seamen who were not for the abolition of impressment, but who still thought that it should only be exercised in cases of emergency. These persons said, let there be impressment in cases of emergency; but let it be made legal, and let the periods at which it shall be made be fixed. And he (Mr. Hume) agreed with them that Parliament ought to fix these periods, so that if he (Mr. Hume), or any other gentleman in that house, were impressed (a laugh),—he could not but say that that was a very childish laugh. (Loud laughter.) It was utterly unworthy of men. (Hear, hear! and a laugh.) He would say that seamen ought to have increased wages until government found some substitute for the present system. He thought the government ought to come manfully to the question, and grant the inquiry. The motion made by the hon. member for Sheffield did not deserve the character given to it by the gentlemen who spoke from the other side, of being intended to take away one of the prerogatives of the Crown. (Hear, hear.) The real and only intention of the motion was to inquire whether or not they should remove the opprobrium which hung at present over the navy in consequence of this system. (Hear, hear.)

Captain ELLIOTT rose to explain, and complained that the hon. member for Middlesex had put words into his mouth which he had never used. The hon. member stated that he (Captain Elliott) had prided himself on the navy having been manned during the war by impressment. He (Captain Elliott) had never said any such thing. No man regretted the necessity of impressment more than he did, or more regretted that it could not be entirely abolished.

MR. HUME said he was sorry if he had stated any thing different from the hon. and gallant captain's opinion. He had certainly misunderstood him.

LORD ALTHORP then rose, and said that the question was certainly one of the very greatest importance. It had been said, however, that this was a question whether impressment of seamen for the navy should be abolished or not, but that was not the question; for it was satisfactory to know that all parties admitted that the power of impressment should necessarily remain in the crown. (Hear, hear.) The question moved by the hon. member for Sheffield, was for a select committee to take into consideration the practicability of devising some plan by which a regular and voluntary supply of seamen might be procured for the navy without recourse to the practice of forcible impressment. The hon. member himself admitted that the power must remain, and the only object of his motion was to enquire whether a more popular plan could be devised for manning the navy without having recourse to it but in cases of emergency. Now his right hon. friend (Sir J. Graham) had stated that he had several measures in view on this very subject, and he asked the liberty of the house for leave to bring in a bill for the establishment of a sufficient registry of seamen. The hon. member had admitted that any plan for the abolition of impressment must be founded on registration; and when it was asked whether his right hon. friend meant to go further than a simple registration, he said certainly; but that that could not be done until it was ascertained if the registration was efficient for the purpose intended. It would be on the registration, if successful, that any future measures should be founded. The very object which the hon. member for Sheffield had in view, was the one which they also had in view. Would the house, then, at the very moment the Government were proceeding to bring in measures to effect this object, take the business out of their hands, merely because the hon. member had made this motion? (Hear, hear.) He knew that many members, who were not aware of the intentions of Government, had come down with the intention of voting for the motion of the hon. member, but would now abstain from so doing. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Middlesex had said that the plan proposed by the Government is a mere trick. What trick? (Hear, hear.) They were trying to mitigate an evil, which all admitted to be an evil; but which all admitted to be a necessary one. (Hear, hear, and No, no, from Mr. Young.) The hon. member who seconded the motion says that he did not say it was a necessary evil. He (Lord Althorp) would ask how this country would like in time of war to see the enemy's fleet at sea, while her own fleet could not leave her harbours for want of seamen to man it (Hear, hear)? He admitted that the power of Impressment should be put in practice as seldom as possible; but if it were abolished entirely, they might find that before the country could be sufficiently protected, the men who should in the first instance have afforded that protection would be lodged in the prisons of the enemy. He thought that everything should be done to mitigate the evils attendant on the system, but that the system itself should not be abolished. He thought that the system of registration proposed by his right hon. friend one was

likely to introduce improvement in the manner of classing the men, and regulating the period of their service, the house would place confidence in his right hon. friend, and instead of taking the subject out of his hands, would rather give him credit for pursuing that course which he thought most likely to have the effect desired by all parties (Hear, hear).

Mr. BUCKINGHAM rose to reply, and said that as the house had already extended to him their unbroken attention during his first address, and must by this time consider the subject nearly exhausted, he should trespass but a few minutes only on their time. As, however, he was anxious to avoid the imputation of factions motives in persisting to divide the house on his original motion, he would frankly say that if the amendment of the right hon. baronet had in any way met the case, he would have yielded to him without hesitation. But it went altogether wide of the mark, and this he thought he should be able to shew—so as to justify his perseverance in asking the house to grant the committee required.

The right hon. baronet had done him the kindness to compliment him upon his opening speech, and to praise it for the talent and discretion which he was pleased to say it displayed. He contrasted this, too, with the tone of certain speeches delivered by him, (Mr. Buckingham) elsewhere, and thought the present an atonement for past indiscretions. He thanked the right hon. baronet for thus reminding him of what might otherwise have escaped his recollection, namely, that there was a still wider contrast between the speeches of the right hon. gentleman delivered to his former constituents at Hull, when a candidate for the representation of that seaport town, and his speeches as First Lord of the Admiralty. In his latter capacity he had defended the practice of impressment, both in the last session and the present; while in his former capacity he had denounced the system as cruel and unjustifiable; and obtained great popularity among the electors of Hull as its determined enemy. (Sir James Graham here intimated across the table, that the hon. member had been misinformed.) Such was the statement which he had himself repeatedly heard from the electors of Hull themselves: and if a total difference of principle should mark the speech of any hon. member in different situations, it was rather extraordinary that such hon. member should complain of a mere difference of tone in the speeches in another. (Hear, hear.)

He would come, however to the main points of the debate. The First Lord of the Admiralty had proposed a Registration of the Merchant Seamen of England, which was to be compulsory, or at least to subject to certain disabilities those who did not act upon it. Now, if this were to be preceded or accompanied by a distinct declaration, that impressment was not to be resorted to but in extreme cases of invasion or insurrection, and then under an Order in Council, for a limited time, and with adequate pay, he should not object to such a bill as a first step to improvement: or if it had been accompanied with an admission, that when the registry was complete, some plan of service by rotation or ballot, was to be substituted for Impressment, he would have consented to its adoption. But as the right hon. Baronet had admitted, that neither of these provisions were to be embraced by the bill, he was quite certain that the seamen of England would consider such a registry as calculated only to facilitate their seizure whenever Impressment should be resorted to: and under this feeling, not 1,000 men in all England would be found to register themselves. They would regard it as a mere snare to entrap them into a description of their names, ages, and places of abode, that they might be the more readily found when the press gangs were sent in their pursuit. (Hear, hear, hear.)

A striking proof that this proposed registry would not abate impressment in its most oppressive form, was this: that the First Lord of the Admiralty admitted it was not intended to abate in any degree the power of impressment on foreign stations, where, he thought it must be allowed to exist in full force. The right hon. baronet had said that in the event of ships of war losing men by battle, or disease, on foreign stations, they must be allowed to supply their losses by impressing the first men they could find; and it was asked how they could otherwise repair their crews? This question might, he thought, be well answered by asking another, namely, this: supposing a ship of war to be disabled on a foreign station, by losing her masts, yards, anchors, or cables, how is she to repair her loss? Certainly not by seizing those indispensable requisites from the first merchant ship she meets, nor by robbing them from the first dock-yard she can find; but by honest payment, of the fair market value of these supplies, to the parties who furnished them. (Hear, hear). Would the house sanction the monstrous doctrine, that it was dishonest to steal by force the materials for repairing a ship's hull or rigging, without paying their full value; but that it was legal and just to rob as many men

as could be found—to deprive them of their liberty—to rob them of the value of their only property—their skill and labour; and to punish them with torture if they dared to refuse. (Hear, hear). No! If the merchant service is in need of men, they cannot seize them by force, under the plea that the national commerce must be maintained; neither should the King's Navy be thus supplied, on the plea that the national defence must be unimpaired. If the navy must be kept up for defence, commerce must be sustained to pay the cost; but let both bear their fair share of the burthen, be it what it may; and for himself he believed there was too strong a sense of honesty and justice in the nation, to refuse to seamen their full remuneration for their services, which all other classes asserted and enjoyed their right to command. (Hear, hear).

This power of impressing abroad surely could not be defended, on the ground of the King's prerogative; that was expressly restricted to the manning the fleet in times of danger, and only in the narrow seas:—that is, in the channels around the island, where defence against invasion would have to be made. But if impressment were to be allowed on all our foreign stations and colonial possessions abroad, this would embrace nearly half the globe; so that every single commander, whether of a line-of-battle ship, or a cutter, would, without any delegation of the King's prerogative—without a press-warrant,—without any authority in short but his individual caprice, be enabled, whenever he thought proper, to press any number of men out of any ship he met, and be accountable to no authority for any such abuse of his power. (Hear, hear, hear.)

The First Lord of the Admiralty had himself, however, furnished the strongest reasons to show that impressment would in future be wholly unnecessary, and that therefore it might be safely abolished. He rejoiced at the improvements which had already been introduced into the naval service; he was glad to find that still more improvement was to follow; and if, as was alleged, the wages of the navy were already nearly equal to that of the merchant service, and the treatment better, was it not an ill compliment to themselves, for the Ministers to suppose that with this superiority of attraction, his Majesty's ships could not obtain men? (Hear, hear.) Why, was it not notorious that privateers, where all the dangers of war, and very many inconveniences not suffered in the navy, were to be endured, could get men in large numbers at any time by voluntary enlistment? Nay, that Don Pedro, or Don Miguel, or any other person in want of seamen to fight their battles, might ship as many men as they wished in the Thames and the Mersey without impressment? (Hear, hear.) These were matters of universal notoriety; and it was an insult to the King's service to suppose that, if the same system of fair bounty, limited time, and adequate wages were tried, men could not be as readily obtained for his Majesty's fleet, as for the squadrons of any other warlike power. (Hear, hear.) The truth is, that seamen generally, so far from disliking danger, rather court it. A voyage of entire fair weather, unrelieved by any incident or adventure, was to them tame and tiresome. They liked an occasional struggle, either in the battle or the breeze; and would generally prefer the hazardous and the enterprising, to the dull regularity of an unvaried round of safety and peace. But though they had no aversion to danger, they abhorred being dragged into it by coercion. (Hear, hear.) Only remove this, and leave it to their own free wills, and the seamen of England would never be found backward to serve their country, at the peril of their lives, whenever their services were required. (Hear, hear, hear.)

The hon. Secretary to the Admiralty (Captain Elliott) had paid him (Mr. Buckingham) the high compliment, for so he considered it, of replying in detail to the speech delivered by him on this question a year ago—to this he had no objection—he only regretted that the pledge under which he felt himself bound to the house to be very brief in his reply, prevented his following the hon. secretary so closely as he could wish. Judging from the speech of the gallant officer, he should say that if his views were correct, that volunteers were more likely to desert than pressed men, the house ought to pass a resolution declaring that no volunteers should ever be received, since they were so liable to desert, but that pressed men and pressed men only should be employed. (Hear.) There was an important omission, however in the gallant captain's statement, respecting the comparative desertions of volunteers and pressed men—He did not explain the different circumstances under which the ships or their crews were placed in either of the cases—so that there might be other causes for their deserting in one instance, and remaining in another, besides that of their being volunteers or impressed men. If the argument of the hon. secretary were worth anything, however, it would go to prove that forced service was more agreeable than voluntary, and therefore ought to be resorted to in all cases. (Hear, hear.)



He asserts, indeed, that King's ships cannot be manned by volunteers, and adds that all the civilized nations of Europe adopt some system of Impressment or other to man their fleets: none but the Americans being able to equip their ships of war without. This contrast is unfortunate, however, for the gallant officer's case, for the superiority of the American navy, manned as it is wholly by volunteers, to all the navies of the old countries of Europe manned by Impressment, is as striking a proof as could be cited, of the superiority of the free system to that of compulsory. (Hear, hear.)

But it was sufficient for him, he thought, to appeal to the good sense of the house, and to ask hon. members whether any serious argument had been offered against going into a committee of enquiry at least. The bill proposed as an amendment, might be a very good bill for effecting its particular object, to register the seamen of the mercantile marine, but it had nothing whatever to do with the subject of impressment, except, indeed, to make it more easy to press seamen than before; for the hon. Secretary to the Admiralty had admitted that registration was only impressment in another form; and undoubtedly, unless accompanied with the limitations of that power which the First Lord of the Admiralty was unwilling to admit, it would be so received by the seamen of England generally. But while officers, who had passed their lives in the service entertained such opposite opinions as we had heard this evening, while great doubt existed as to the legality, and still more as to the efficiency of the practice, he could not conceive a stronger case for a Committee of Enquiry at least, before which the conflicting evidence would be sifted, in which the right hon. baronet's bill might be considered, and the result of the whole reported to the house. In the name, then, of the seamen of England, and of the large body of landsmen who as their fellow subjects had sympathised with their wrongs and petitioned on their behalf, he intreated the house to yield to the justice of their claims, and grant him the Committee of Enquiry which his motion sought. (Hear, hear, hear.)

The question was then put from the chair, and the amendment read, when a division took place on the original motion, the result of which was—For the motion for a committee, 130; Against it, 212. The motion was therefore lost by a majority of 83. A list of the Minority who voted for the committee will be found in its proper place. That of the Majority is not yet obtained; but we hope to be able to present it in our next.

#### UNFAIR TREATMENT OF THE LANDED INTEREST—WHO SHOULD PAY THE INTEREST OF THE DEBT?

Sir,

*Lincoln March 1, 1834.*

I THINK the landholders are unfairly dealt with by the advocates of a Repeal of the Corn Laws. Criminal as the landed interest has been, it would not be right to compel them to pay the whole of the debt, which, by-the-by, has been so greatly increased by that fraudulent measure, called Peel's Bill. At the commencement of the French Revolution, the aristocracy and clergy certainly plunged this country into a war with France, to avoid the contagion of French principles, or, in other words to prevent Parliamentary and Church Reform; but afterwards, when Buonaparte became ruler in France, the war was continued to frustrate his design of conquering England, on which, if he had been successful, would have followed the confiscation of the large estates of the aristocracy to enrich his generals, and the annihilation of the funds to enable him to acquire the sanction of the people to his sway, by reducing their burthens. Now if my view be correct, the fundholders and landholders ought to pay the debt between them. The working class at all events can have nothing to do with it, because it cannot be shown that it was incurred to benefit them.

I am, Sir, your humble servant,

A. B.

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

- Owing to the length of the Debate on Impressment, we have been obliged to omit several General Communications, as well as Original Articles, for which we hope to find room in our next

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

### LIST OF THE MAJORITY OF 192,

(Tellers included), who, on the 26th of February, voted for the Second Reading of the Liverpool Disfranchisement Bill.

For the Disfranchisement . . . . .	192
Against it . . . . .	40

### ENGLAND.

Aglionby, H.	Evans, Colonel	Lister, E.	Stanley, Hon. T.
Astley, Sir J. D.	Faithfull, G.	Lloyd, J. H.	Stanley, E. J. N.
Attwood, T.	Fenton, J.	Locke, W.	Strickland, Sir G.
Bainbridge, E. T.	Feilden, W.	Mangles, J.	Strutt, E.
Beaumont, T. W.	Fielden, J.	Marshall, J.	Talbot, W. H. F.
Barnard, E. G.	Folkes, Sir W.	Methuen, P.	Talmash, A. G.
Biddulph, R.	Fort, J.	Mildmay, P. St. J.	Tancred, H. W.
Bish, T.	Fryer, R.	Molesworth, Sir W.	Tayleur, W.
Blackburne, J.	Gaskell, D.	Moreton, Hon. A. H.	Tennyson, Rt Hon. C.
Bouverie, Hon. D. P.	Gisborne, T.	Morrison, J.	Thicknesse, R.
Blake, Sir F.	Glynne, Sir S. R.	Mosley, Sir O.	Thomson, Hon. C. P.
Blunt, Sir C. R.	Godson, R.	Mostyn, Hon. E. M.	Throckmorton, R. G.
Bolling, W. B.	Gordon, R.	Parker, J.	Todd, Ruddell
Boss, J. G.	Goring, H. D.	Parrott, J.	Tooke, W.
Briggs, R.	Grant, Right Hon. R.	Pease, J.	Tower, C. T.
Brocklehurst, J.	Grey, Hon. Colonel	Philips, M.	Tracy, C. H.
Brodie, B.	Grote, G.	Ponsonby, Hon. W.	Trelawney, W. S.
Brotherton, J.	Guest, J. J.	Potter, R.	Troubridge, Sir E.
Buckingham, J. S.	Hall, Benjamin	Poulter, J.	Turner, W.
Buller, C.	Handley, B.	Pryme, G.	Tynte, C. J. K.
Bulwer, H. L.	Hardy, John	Rice, Hon. T. S.	Verney, Sir H.
Carter, J. B.	Harland, W. C.	Richards, J.	Vincent, Sir F.
Cayley, E. S.	Heathcote, J. J.	Rickford, W.	Walker, R.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Heneage, G. F.	Rippon, C.	Walter, J.
Clive, E. B.	Hill, M.	Robinson, G. R.	Warburton, H.
Cotes, J.	Hodges, T. L.	Roebuck, J. A.	Ward, H. G.
Crawford, W.	Hoskins, Kedgwin	Rolfe, R. M.	Warre, J.
Crompton, J.	Hume, Joseph	Romilly, E.	Waterpark, Lord
Davies, Col.	Hurat, R. H.	Romilly, J.	Watkins, L.
Dawson, E.	Hutt, William	Rooper, J. B.	Wedgwood, J.
Divet, E.	Keppell, Major G.	Roth, B.	Whitmore, W. W.
Donkin, Sir R. S.	King, E. B.	Russell, Lord	Wigney, I. N.
Dundas, Captain J.	Kennedy, James	Scott, Sir E. D.	Wilbraham, G.
Dundas, Hon. J. C.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Scrope, C. P.	Williams, W. A.
Dykes, F. L.	Lefevre, C. S.	Shawe, R. N.	Williams, Colonel
Ellce, E.	Lennard, T. B.	Sheppard, T.	Windham, W. H.
Ellis, W.	Lennox, Lord G.	Smith, J. A.	Wood, C.
Etwall, R.	Lester, B. L.	Smith, J.	Young, G. F.
Evans, W.			

### SCOTLAND.

Adam, Admiral C.	Jeffrey, Rt. Hon. F.	Ormelie, Earl of	Pringle, R.
Dalmeny, Lord	Mackenzie, J. A. S.	Oswald, R. A.	Sharp, General M.
Fergusson, R. C.	Murray, J. A.	Oswald, J.	Stuart, R.
Hallyburton, D. G.	Olipphant, L.	Parnell, Sir H.	Wallace, R.
Hay, Colonel A.			

## IRELAND.

Barron, W.	Finn, W. F.	O'Connell, M.	Ruthven, E. S.
Barry, G. S.	Fitzgerald, T.	O'Connell, J.	Ruthven, E.
Bellew, R. M.	Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connell, M.	Sheil, R. L.
Blake, M.	Knox, Hon. Col. J.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Vigors, N. A.
Butler, Hon. P.	Lalor, P.	Roche, D.	Walker, C. A.
Evans, G.	O'Connell, D.	Roe, J.	Wallace, T.

## PAIRED OFF.

Elliott, Captain	Mr. Bowes	Brougham, W.	Browne, D.
Gillon, W. D.	Paget, Charles	Clay, W.	Pendarves, E. W.
Hawes, B.	Lennox, Lord A.	Ferguson, Sir R.	Abercromby, J.

TELLERS.—Bennett, J.—Wason, R.

## LIST OF THE MINORITY of 40,

Tellers included, who voted against the Second Reading of the Bill for the Disfranchisement of the Liverpool Freeman.

Baillie, J.	Estcourt, T. G. B.	Halford, H.	Lowther, Hon. H.
Bentinck, Lord G.	Egerton, W. T.	Hanmer, Sir J.	Marryat, J.
Bethell, R.	Finch, G.	Hannier, Colonel H.	Meynell, Captain H.
Blackstone, W. S.	Fleetwood, Captain	Hayes, Sir E.	Ryle, J.
Blayney, Hon. C.	Forrester, Hon. C.	Herbert, Hon. S.	Somerset, Lord G.
Chapman, A.	Gaskell, J. M.	Hodgson, J.	Verner, Colonel
Christmas, W.	Gladstone, T.	Hope, H. T.	Villiers, Viscount
Darlington, Lord	Gladstone, W. E.	Inglis, Sir R. H.	Wall, C. B.
Dillwyn L.	Greene, T.	Iton, S.	Willoughby, Sir H.
Eastnor, Lord	Halcomb, J.		

## PAIRED OFF.

Fremantle, Sir T.	Holdsworth J.	Boss, C.	Fazakerly, T.
Grimston, Viscount	Stuart, Lord D.		

TELLERS.—Sandon, Viscount.—Nicholl, J.

## LIST OF THE MINORITY of 46,

Teller included, who voted in favour of Mr. Hume's motion to reduce the number of the standing Army to be kept up for the year 1834-5, from 89,419, as proposed by Ministers, to 80,419 men.

For the reduction of 9000 men	.	.	.	.	46
Against the reduction	.	.	.	.	282

## ENGLAND.

Aglionby, H. A.	Fellowes, Hon. N.	Kennedy, J.	Scrope P.
Bames, E.	Fellowes, W. A.	Lister, C.	Strutt, E.
Brocklehurst, J.	Fielden, J.	Lloyd, J. H.	Trelawney, W. L. S.
Brotherton, J.	Grote, J.	Parrott, J.	Turner, W.
Clay, W.	Humphery, J.	Potter, R.	Whalley, Sir S.
Evans, Colonel	Inglby, Sir W.	Romilly, E.	Wood, Alderman
Ewart, W.	Jervis, J.	Scholefield, J.	Williams, Colonel
Faithfull, G.			

## SCOTLAND.

Gillon, W. D.	Parnell, Sir H.
---------------	-----------------

## IRELAND.

Blake, M.	Lalor, P.	O'Connell, J.	Ruthven, E. S.
Evans, G.	O'Connell, D.	O'Connor, F.	Ruthven, E.
Finn, W. F.	O'Connell, M.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Vigors, N. A.
Jacob, E.	O'Connell, M.		

TELLER.—Hume, J.

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 172,

Tellers included, who voted in favour of Sir W. Ingilby's Motion for a Committee to enquire what Reduction could be effected in the Malt Tax.

## ENGLAND.

Adams, E. H.	Dashwood, G.	Hanmer, Sir J.	Robinson, G. R.
Aglionby, H. A.	Davies, Colonel	Hammer, Colonel H.	Rooper, J. B.
Aibuthnot, Hon. A.	Dillwyn, L.	Harvey, D. W.	Russell, W.
Attwood, M.	Duffield, T.	Hardy, J.	Seale, Colonel
Attwood, T.	Dugdale, D. S.	Herbert, Hon. S.	Simeon, Sir R.
Baillie, J.	Dundas, Captain	Hope, H. T.	Spry, S.
Bainbridge, E.	Dawson, E.	Henniker, Lord	Stanley, E.
Bankes, W. J.	Duncombe, Hon. H.	Irton, S.	Stewart, J.
Baring, A.	Durham, Sir P.	Jervis, J.	Sanford, E.
Baring, H.	Egerton, W.	Jolliffe, H.	Sanderson, R.
Barnard, E. G.	Etwall, R.	Kennedy, J.	Shawe, R.
Beauclerk, Major	Faithfull, C.	Keppel, Hon. G.	Tancred, H. W.
Bell, M.	Fancourt, Major	Kerrison, Sir E.	Townshend, Lord C.
Benett, J.	Fellowes, Hon. H.	Leech, J.	Taylor, M. A.
Blackstone, W. S.	Fellowes, Hon. N.	Lennox, Lord W.	Tennyson, Rt. Hon. C.
Briggs, R.	Fielden, J.	Lincoln, Earl of	Tower, J.
Bruce, Lord E.	Finch, G.	Lister, E.	Trevor, Hon. G. R.
Brudenell, Lord	Foley, Hon. E.	Lowther, Hon. H. G.	Trelawney, W. L. S.
Buckingham, J. S.	Folkes, Sir W.	Lygon, Hon. H.	Tyrell, Sir J.
Burrell, Sir C.	Forrester, Hon. W.	Martin, J.	Tyrell, C.
Burton, H.	Fremantle, Sir T.	Meynell, Captain	Tynte, C. J. K.
Buxton, T. F.	Fryer, R.	Miles, W.	Tollemache, Hon. A.
Berkeley, Hon. G.	Gaskell, J. M.	Milton, Lord	Vernon, G.
Cartwright, W.	Gaskell, D.	Norreys, Lord	Walter, J.
Cayley, E. S.	Godson, R.	Palmer, R.	Weyland, Major
Chandos, Marquis	Grimston, Viscount	Palmer, General	Williams, Colonel
Chaplin, Colonel	Goring, H.	Parker, Sir H.	Williams, R.
Clive, Hon. R.	Guise, Sir W.	Parrott, J.	Wilmot, Sir E.
Clayton, Sir W.	Gully, J.	Pigot, R.	Wood, Colonel
Cotes, J.	Halcomb, J.	Pelham, Hon. C.	Windham, W. H.
Crawley, S.	Halford, H.	Poulter, J.	Welby, G.
Curteis, H. B.	Hall, B.	Richards, J.	Vigors, N. A.
Dare, R. H.	Handley, H.	Rippon, C.	Wilks, J.
Darlington, Earl of			

## IRELAND.

Blaney, Hon. C.	Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connell, M.	Roche, D.
Barry, G. S.	Fitzgerald, T.	O'Connell, J.	Ruthven, E. S.
Butler, Hon. Col.	Hayes, Sir E.	O'Connell, M.	Ruthven, E.
Blake, M.	Jacob, E.	O'Connor, F.	Sheil, R. L.
Cole, Viscount	Lalor, P.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Sullivan, R.
Conolly, Colonel	Maxwell, J.	Roß, J.	Vigors, N. A.
Daly, J.	O'Connell, D.	Roche, W.	Wallace, T.
Finu, W. F.			

## SCOTLAND.

Bruce, C.	Gordon, Hon. W.	Maxwell, J.	Sinclair, G.
Gillon, W.	Grant, Hon. Col.	"	

## PAIRED OFF.

Bowes, J.	Handley, B.	Ossulston, Lord	Tynte, C.
Denison, W. J.	Fleetwood, Captain		

TELLERS.—Hum e, J.—Ingilby, Sir W.

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 132.

Tellers included, who voted for Mr. Buckingham's Motion, That a Select Committee be appointed to take into consideration the practicability of devising some plan by which a regular and voluntary supply of Seamen may be procured for his Majesty's Navy, without recourse to the practise of forcible Impressment.

For the Motion	.	.	.	.	.	.	132
Against it ..	.	.	.	.	.	.	220

## ENGLAND.

Adam, E. J.	Dawson, E.	Jervis, J.	Roebuck, J. A.
Aglionby, H. A.	Dundas, Hon. J. C.	Kemp, T. R.	Romilly, J.
Anson, Hon. Geo.	Elles, Wynn	Kennedy, J.	Romilly, E.
Attwood, T.	Evans, W.	Lambton, H.	Rumbold, C. F.
Bailhe, J. E.	Ewart, Wm.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Scholefield, Jos.
Bainbridge, E. T.	Faithfull, George	Lennox, Lord W.	Shawe, R. N. E.
Barnes, Ed.	Fancourt, Major	Lester, B. L.	Simeon, Sir R. G.
Barnard, E. G.	Fort, John	Lister, E. C.	Staunton, Sir G.
Beaucherk, Major	Fenton, J.	Lloyd, J. H.	Stuart, Lord Dudley
Bowes, T.	Fielden, J.	Lushington, Dr.	Strutt, E.
Bish, Thomas	Gaskell, D.	Maryatt, Joseph	Thicknesse, R.
Briscoe, J.	Grote, G.	Marsland, T.	Thompson, Ald.
Brodie, Capt.	Gully, John	Mills, J.	Throckmorton, R. G.
Brotherton, J.	Halcomb, John	Morrison, James	Trelawney, W. L. S.
Bulwer, E. L.	Hall, B.	Ord, W. H.	Vernon, G. H.
Bulwer, H. L.	Hardy, J.	Parrot, Jasper	Vincent, Sir F.
Chaytor, Sir W.	Harland, Wm. C.	Pease, Joseph	Walker, R.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Harvey, D. W.	Philips, M.	Warburton, H.
Clay, Wm.	Hawes, B.	Plumtre, J. P. E.	Wason, R.
Clive, E. B.	Hawkins, J. H.	Potter, Richard	Whalley, Sir Samuel
Codrington, Sir Ed.	Hughes, Hughes	Poulter, John	Wigney, I. N.
Collier, J.	Humphery, John	Pryme, George	Wilks, John
Curteis, H. B.	Hurst, R. H.	Rider, Thomas	Wood, Alderman
Curteis, Capt. E. B.	Hutt, W.	Rippon, C.	Young, G. F.
Davies, Col.	Ingham, R.	Robinson, G. R.	

## SCOTLAND.

Colquhoun, J. C.	Maxwell, J.	Parnell, Hon. Sir H.	Stewart, Robert
Ewing, James	Oswald, Richard	Sinclair, G.	Wallace, Robert
Johnston, Andrew	Oswald, Jas.		

## IRELAND.

Barry, G. S.	Lalor, P.	O'Connell, John	Rathven, E.
Bellow, R. M.	Lynch, H.	O'Connor, F.	Ruthven, E. S.
Blake, M. J.	O'Connell, D.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Sheil, R. L.
Evans, G.	O'Connell, M.	O'Reilly, William	Vigers, N. A.
Fitzgerald, T.	O'Connell, Mautice	Roche, Wm.	Wallace, Thos.
Fitzsimon, C.			

Tellers.—Buckingham, J. S.—Hume, Joseph.

## REVISED LIST OF MEMBERS.

As all the Vacancies in the Representation are now filled up, we shall give, in our next Number, a Revised List of the House of Commons, with the designation of the Political Party to which each Member belongs, so as to show the exact numerical strength of the Tories, Whigs, and Liberals in the House at the present time.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1834.

HISTORICAL FACTS AND LEGAL ARGUMENTS FOR  
THE ABOLITION OF IMPRESSMENT.

WE promised, in our last Number, that we would include in the present, the historical and documentary evidence which we took down to the House of Commons, for the purpose of using there, to substantiate any of our positions which might have been called in question; but which were not then read, as the assertions grounded on them were not disputed. As, however, the subject still retains its interest, we avail ourselves of the present opportunity, once for all, until the question shall again be brought forward, when no one now doubts that it will be triumphantly carried, to place on record here, the documents alluded to, giving merely such introductory observations on each, as may be sufficient to explain their object and bearing.

The following is a portion of the memorial addressed by the mariners of England to George III., in 1760, through the then Duke of Cumberland, as referred to in the speech, page 198.

"We approach your royal person, with an humble but immoveable confidence in your protection, imploring that British Sailors, exposed by their profession, to various unavoidable evils, unknown to your other subjects, may no longer have these fruitlessly and wantonly increased by the cruel and lawless tyranny of press-gangs."—They conclude their interesting and powerful appeal, in the following terms:—"Were there *no possibility* of effecting the purpose of a Naval war but by the practice of Impressing, were pressing the *best* method of doing it, though it might be effected by other means, we your Petitioners, are so sensible of what is due to our country, and so willing in our obedience to your Majesty, that we would cheerfully sacrifice our convenience to national good, and the patriotic designs of our King. But while we are convinced that pressing answers no good end to either, that it is ineffectual for manning the Navy, that it prolongs our wars for the want of a proper exertion of our real national strength, that it is therefore productive of numerous and heavy taxes, that it makes property precarious, that it is destructive of trade, that thousands perish miserably in filth and contagion, victims to its tyranny, that it affects the personal security of all your Majesty's subjects, without which all other blessings can have no existence, we supplicate your Majesty's interposition, to prevent the impolitic and abominable practice."

To show that the feeling has in no degree abated since that period, and that the seamen of England are just as keenly alive to the evils of Impressment now, as they were seventy years ago, the following

passage is given from the address of the seamen of South Shields, in the last year only, referred to in the same place.

[ "The system of Impressment we consider to be a curse of the most degrading kind, as it makes us, the seamen of Great Britain, *outlaws* in our native land. The debtor, keeping within his house, is protected by law, and cannot be broken in upon to be arrested: whereas the press-gang will violate the sanctity of the private dwelling, and steal a seaman out of his bed, from the bosom of his family, and from all that makes life dear to him; and this, for no other crime than that he is a British sailor. He is then immured in the hold of a tender, a dungeon of the worst description. From thence he is transferred to the receiving or guard-ship; a sink of infamy of the most disgusting kind; and from thence to some vessel in active service, where, without regard to age or constitution, he is dragged away to some distant or unhealthy climate, there to perish, and leave his disconsolate family to misery and want;—and all this for a most inadequate pay—for an unlimited service—with his dependent children sunk into paupers, with no one to help them in their distress."

In reference to the celebrated charge, of Sir Michael Foster, the Recorder of Bristol, on which Sir James Graham so much relied, it was remarked, page 199, that Benjamin Franklin took this charge to pieces in a masterly manner.

A single passage or two will suffice to show the mode in which the Bristol Recorder's arguments were met. The Judge alleges, first, that the Crown has a right to the personal service of *every man*, in case of invasion, and, therefore, it may take men of any particular class, and leave the rest, if all are not wanted, for the public service. To which Franklin most appropriately replies:

"The conclusion here from the *whole* to a *part*, does not seem to be good logic. When the personal service of *every man* is called for, there the burthen is equal. Not so when the service of part is called for, and others excused. If the whole alphabet should say, let us fight for the defence of the whole; that is equality, and may therefore be just. But if they should say, let A, B, C, and D, go and fight for us, while we stay at home and sleep in whole skins, that is not equal, and therefore cannot be just."

Foster had also asserted, and others had repeated the expression after him, that the pressing a merchant seamen and compelling him to serve in the Navy, was merely a change of masters, as all the circumstances remained the same (which, however, is notoriously untrue, as the circumstances are different in almost every particular, and the change is not voluntary but compulsory) and if there were private mischief now and then occasioned by this practice, it *must* be submitted to for avoiding a public inconvenience, which Franklin answers in substance thus:

"Mr. Justice Foster contends that the King wants good seamen—landsmen will not do—that the best seamen must be had to man the fleet, and having chosen the profession of the sea, it is no hardship on them to compel them to go to sail the King's ships instead of merchant ships, which, as had been frequently asserted, was after all a mere change of masters, nothing more. But, says Franklin, good lawyers are necessary to carry on the affairs of Government—men who are not lawyers will not do. Nay, the King has a right to the services of the best lawyers to man his courts, and their having freely chosen the profession of the law, it is no hardship to make them work for the King, instead of having a private merchant for their client—it is but a mere change of masters after all. Judge Foster then, being one of these best lawyers, whose services the King has a right to command, let him be forthwith seized, by virtue of the King's prerogative—sent to the colonies, to labour in his profession at tenpence a day, and console

himself with the comfortable assurance that the necessities of the State alone have led to this honourable exile!"

But, to make the parallel complete, Franklin should have imposed upon the impressed judge the necessity, not merely of pleading the King's cause for the King's pay, but of fighting any body that disputed the King's supremacy, and taking all the hard knocks, leaden bullets, and cannon balls, as so much extra emolument. The profession that the sailor *chooses*, is to be a peaceful mariner:—the profession to which he is dragged by force, is that of a hired fighter. But sailing and fighting, though both are done upon the sea, are not the same profession. It is, therefore, not merely a change of masters, but a total change of occupation; with total deprivation of liberty, increased danger, increased punishment, and decreased pay. Franklin continues:

"When Judge Foster speaks of impressing, he diminishes the horror of the practice as much as possible, by presenting to the mind one sailor only, suffering a hardship, as he tenderly calls it, in some *particular cases* only, and he places against this private mischief the inconvenience to the trade of the kingdom. But if, as is often the case, the sailor who is pressed, and obliged to serve for the defence of his trade, at the rate of 25s. a month, could have 75s. in the Merchant's service, you take from him 50s. a month, and if you have 100,000 men in your service, you rob that honest part of society and their poor families of 250,000*l.* per month, or three millions a year, and at the same time oblige them to hazard their lives in fighting for the defence, of your trade; to the defence of which all ought indeed to contribute (and sailors among the rest) in proportion to their profits by it; but this three millions is more than their share, if they did not pay with their persons; and when you force that, surely you should excuse the other. But it may be said, to give the King's seamen Merchant's wages would cost the nation too much, and call for more taxes. The question, then, would amount to this: whether it be just in a community that the richer part should compel the poorer to fight for them and their property, for such wages as they think fit to allow, and punish them if they refuse. The Judge tells us it is *legal*. I have not law enough to dispute his authority, but I cannot persuade myself it is *equitable*. I will, however, own for the present, that pressing may be lawful when necessary; but then I contend that it may be used so as to produce the same good effect, the *public security*, without doing so much horrible injustice as attends the pressing common seamen. In order to be by them understood, I should premise two things: First, that voluntary seamen might be had for the service if they were sufficiently paid. The proof of this is, that to serve in the same ships, and incur the same dangers, you have no occasion to impress captains, lieutenants, second lieutenants, midshipmen, pursers, nor any other officers. Why—but that the profit of their places, or the emoluments expected, are sufficient inducement? The business is then, by impressing, to find money sufficient to make the sailors all volunteers, as well as their officers, and this without any fresh burden upon trade. The second of my premises is, that 25s. a month, with his share of the salt beef, pork, and pease pudding, being found sufficient for the subsistence of hard working seamen, it will certainly be so for a sedentary scholar or gentleman. I would then propose to form a treasury, out of which bounties to seamen should be paid. To fill this treasury, I would impress a number of civil officers, who at present have great salaries, oblige them to serve in their respective offices for 25s. per month, with their share of the mess of provisions, and throw the rest of their salary into the seamen's treasury. If such a press-warrant was given me to execute, the first person I would press should be a Recorder of Bristol, or a First Lord of the Admiralty, because I might have need of his edifying example, to show how such impressing ought to be borne with; for he would certainly find that though to be reduced to 25s. per month might be a *private mischief*, yet that agreeable to his *maxim of law and good policy*, it *ought to be borne with patience* for preventing a national calamity. Then I would press the rest of the judges, and opening the Red Book, I would



press every civil officer of Government from 50*l.* a-year, up to 50,000*l.*, which would throw an immense sum into our treasury, and these gentlemen could not well complain, since they would receive their 25*s.* a-month, and their rations, and that too, without being obliged to fight, or to incur the danger of shipwreck, as sailors daily do."

Sir James Graham relied also on a passage in a speech of Lord Chatham's, which was uttered at a moment when great excitement prevailed; but he altogether overlooked the following splendid passages in the speech of that great statesman, delivered on the occasion of Lord Pulteney's Bill, for the more speedily manning the navy, as referred to at page 200.

"I shall grant, Sir, that immemorial custom has hitherto warranted, and that even a late statute has, by implication, authorized the pressing of seamen, *in cases of absolute necessity, but no such necessity can ever exist, if there be time for trying any other method; and when there is time, no such necessity can ever exist, until after every other method has been tried*; from whence I must conclude that the pressing of seamen upon this last occasion was not authorized either by custom or statute, and consequently it was absolutely illegal.

"I believe, Sir, it will now appear that, with regard to pressing, our Ministers have in several respects made a little too free with our constitution; therefore it is high time for Parliament to take this practise, which smells so rank of arbitrary power, into their most serious consideration, and to embrace every method that can be thought of for preventing or rendering less frequent the necessity of our having recourse to that unjust and violent practice. All the other subjects of Great Britain may sit secure under their own fig trees, without being in danger of ever being called out to serve the public in any station, unless it comes to their turn, or they voluntarily engage in the service: but our seamen, a set of men whom of all others we ought most to indulge, can never be secure whilst they are under the age of fifty-five.

"After a seaman, by hard service of many years at sea, has earned and saved as much as may establish him in a quiet retreat at land, he does not know but that in six months, or a less time, he may be torn from his wife and family, and forced to undergo all the fatigues and perils of a common seaman, without any certainty of ever being released while he is fit for serving in that station. Does not justice, humanity, and gratitude, require that our seamen should be exempted as much as possible from this condition? Can this be done any other way but by engaging seamen to enter voluntarily into the King's service?"

In the same debate, Mr. Gilbert Elliott, eldest son of Sir Gilbert Elliott, Bart, of Minto, soon afterwards made a Commissioner of the Admiralty, then a member for Selkirk, and an ancestor, it is believed, of the gallant captain, the present Secretary to the Admiralty, deprecated the system of Impressment, and said,

"Though this method of pressing has of late years been often practised in times of peace, yet I think it has never been expressly authorized by law. In this country, and indeed in any free country, nothing can excuse it but the most urgent necessity, which necessity we ought to prevent by every means that can be contrived."

But, as this is a point of considerable importance, and one which ought to be set at rest once for all, we avail ourselves of this opportunity to cite two passages from a series of very able letters from the pen of a naval officer, who has devoted years of attention to this subject, and who has elucidated every part of it in the most satisfactory manner. He says:

"But, Sir, if the prerogative to impress mariners was ever lawfully invested in the monarch, it has been surrendered by the deliberate act of a King of Eng-

land,—a King, too, most jealous and tenacious of all questions affecting his privilege. I allude not to Magna Charta, forced from an unwilling sovereign at the point of the sword, by his subjects in arms around him, on which (confirmed as it is by many subsequent statutes, clinched by the Bill of Rights, and rivetted by the King's oath to govern by the laws), I might well rest my argument; but to 16 and 17 Car. I., cap. 5, 23 and 26, being solemn acts of the legislature, bearing the royal assent, and made for the purpose of *legalizing* the pressing of seamen. By these the Lord High Admiral is authorised to issue warrants for raising "so many mariners, sailors, watermen, surgeons, gunners, and ship-carpenters, as shall be required, *to be employed in guarding the narrow seas, and the necessary defence of the realm, in this time of imminent danger.*" So that although the King had surrendered his prerogative, the *Parliament did not even assume the power of pressing men to be sent abroad.*

"And this, Sir, is not the only case; for 4 and 5 Anne, cap. 19, is an act for the pressing of mariners, and was passed, according to our historians, because the *power of the prerogative was doubtful*, and, as by this statute, houses could be broken open to search for concealed seamen, it was apprehended by the crown lawyers that litigations would arise out of such proceedings, which might bring the legality of press warrants themselves (always an awkward question), into dispute before the courts, therefore they deemed it prudent to *legalise* it by statute; but this, like those in Charles's time, was a *temporary act*, for, as Rushworth says, the Parliament of 1641 "was tender of bringing the way of pressing into practice." And Sir Matthew Hale, that learned judge and upright man, who was contemporary with these times, and must have known the motives which then influenced men's actions, says, in his Pleas of the Crown, that these statutes were passed because the King's prerogative to press mariners was doubted." \*

The cases that were referred to, of resistance to the press-gang, which occurred at Hull, are thus detailed in the Hull papers of the day. The facts of the resistance and of the slaughter that ensued, need not be repeated; as the object of referring to them was not to exhibit the cruelty of Impressment, which was unnecessary, but to show the legality of the resistance, and the consequent illegality of the power resisted, as proved by the verdicts of acquittal pronounced on those who were arraigned on the charge of murder, for killing individuals belonging to the press-gang, which killing was thus pronounced to be *not murder*, but lawful slaying in self-defence. The first case was of the date of August 2, 1794.

"Mark Bolt was charged upon oath with firing a pistol, loaded with gunpowder and slugs, at Charles Darley, of this town, mariner, whereby the said Charles Darley was wounded in the left breast. The same Mark Bolt stood charged also upon the Coroner's Inquest with Manslaughter, for killing and slaying the said Charles Darley in his own defence.

"The Judge, in his charge to the Grand Jury, at the opening of the Assizes, recommended this case to their particular attention. He observed, that at a time like the present, it was the duty of every good subject to give all possible energy to the operations of government; "that as hitherto no other method of manning the navy was found to be effectual, except the compulsory one of impressing, *it was* obliged to be resorted to in times of emergency, after the usual inducement of bestowing extraordinary bounties was found insufficient; that therefore any resistance on the part of a person who was liable to be impressed, *against those* who were duly authorized for the service, would be dangerous to encourage, and required exemplary punishment.

"The address, however, failed of its effect. Notwithstanding that the gentlemen who composed the Grand Jury were persons of unquestionable loyalty, and the steady friends of government, notwithstanding the intimation from the learned Judge, that their characters as friends to the constitution were in some degree implicated in the event of the trial, and notwithstanding the fear of incurring the suspicion of being encouragers of resistances in the common people, they refused

to find a Bill of Indictment. They could not understand, that in order to support the measures of Government, it was necessary to support an infamous abuse of power in some of the lowest of its delegates."

The second case was quite as remarkable, and this was the one witnessed by Mr. Pryme, then a youth residing at Hull, and now member for Cambridge. The case excited so much interest at Hull that almost every individual then living at Hull, and now alive, remembers all its details. The narrative itself is deeply interesting, but we forbear from entering on that, and content ourselves with the legal issue which is thus described in the Hull paper of March 21, 1801.

"At York Assizes, on Friday last, came on before Mr. Justice Chambers and a respectable Jury, the trial of Captain W. H. Mitchinson, of this port, for the murder of William Burnock and John Sykes, two of the crew of the *Nonsuch* man-of-war. Our readers will recollect that these died in consequence of the wounds they received on the 30th of July, 1798, from the crew of the *Blenheim*, then under the command of Captain Mitchinson, which ship they attempted to board in her passage up the Humber, from Greenland, for the purpose of impressing the men, but were frustrated in their design by an obstinate resistance. As this was a cause of general importance, in which the interests of almost every description of persons, and particularly those of the inhabitants of maritime towns were implicated, the Court was greatly crowded. The trial commenced at nine o'clock in the morning, and continued until near eight in the evening: the utmost exertions and ingenuity were exercised by the counsel on both sides.

"After the examination of witnesses was closed, the learned Judge, in addressing the Jury, commented upon the evidence at a considerable length, and having placed it in a perspicuous point of view, left it for them to determine the guilt or innocence of the prisoner. The Jury without hesitating a moment brought in a verdict of 'Not Guilty.' The Judge immediately ordered Captain Mitchinson to be discharged. The most lively exultation was manifested by the spectators in the court.

"It is almost unnecessary to state that the news of Captain Mitchinson's acquittal produced lively demonstrations of joy in this place. The populace, who were assembled in great numbers on Saturday noon, waiting the arrival of Captain Mitchinson, took the horses from the coach in which the witnesses were returning, and dragged it three times round the statue of King William in the market-place, in triumph. Captain Mitchinson himself did not arrive until the evening of that day."

Advertence was made in another part of the speech, page 201, to the wretched state of the crews of our ships of war, as a consequence of Impressment. Instead of getting a choice of the best men, which voluntary entry, adequate pay, and limited service would secure, none but the very refuse of the seafaring body remained in England to be impressed, the best and the bravest of our seamen being driven by the terror of the press-gang to other countries for employment, of which the following evidence will perhaps be deemed conclusive.

"Admiral Ekins, in his '*Naval Battles*,' relates a number of instances of the inferiority of the draughts of men, in appearance and muscular strength, as well as character, who were sent on board our ships during the last war. He asserts that Sir Home Popham, while fitting out His Majesty's ship *Stirling Castle* for the East Indies, actually weighed his crew of six hundred men, and the average was only jockey weight. On stating the circumstances to the Admiralty, he had two hundred of them changed for heavier men.

"The *Conqueror* (74) had not more than twenty effective seamen on board in 1804; and, in 1803, when the *Donegal* and *Belleisle* were sent out to the Mediterranean, they had not twenty men each who could take the helm. The *Conqueror*, after the battle of Trafalgar, had only eight men on board (after manning her prize) who could knot a shroud;

"The system was to split one tolerable ship's company into three, and then fill up, with all the men that could be procured from the prison and jail ships. Thus the ship's company of the *Prince* (which was a tolerably good one) was, in 1809, draughted into the *Vanguard*, *Goliath*, and *Jupiter*, and the remainder of the crews of these ships were completed in the manner described."

But, besides the miserable condition of the crews, there was no collecting even these without great difficulty and great delay; and so far from the impress system being one that secured a prompt supply of men in an hour of need, it was far inferior in its promptitude to the systems followed by every other country. On this subject we may quote, as evidence of the most conclusive kind, the following passage from one of the able series of letters before alluded to, and published in the *Naval and Military Gazette*, under the signature of MERCATOR, letters full of the most varied knowledge, legal, professional, and practical, and deserving the attention of all who would wish to attain a thorough understanding of the subject. The passage was written just immediately after the debate of last session on the question of Impressment, and is as follows :

"I shall say little as respects the arguments advanced to show the necessity of Impressment, for the public journals have already canvassed that point freely. But it surprised me to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer ground his defence upon the *promptitude* with which it enabled us to fit our fleets on urgent occasions,—I mean as compared with France, our most powerful rival. I challenge the noble lord to mention a single instance when it has succeeded in doing so; on the contrary, the French have, at the commencement of the seven last wars, *been first at sea*, as I have proved by the documents in my *third and fourth* letters. Of what use, then, is such a power to us when the French have a speedier process? I would not have your readers take my assertion on this point in opposition to the noble lord's; but no one will question Sir George Cockburn's authority, and on the 16th June, 1828, he informed the Select Finance Committee of the House, 'that the French have a mode of manning their fleet *much more quick than we have of manning ours*.' He goes on to describe it. Their system, arbitrary as it is, and which I am far from defending (being well convinced that one equally efficient, but divested of its oppression, can be organized here), has, at least, this merit, *that it answers the purpose it is designed for*; whilst ours (though much more revolting), so far from doing so, has the effect (after the first surprise) of driving thousands of seamen into hiding, and finally to desert their country, at the very moment when their services are in most request; and the reader may be assured that, should a war occur with that powerful nation to-morrow, they could ship every sailor in France, and have their vessels at sea, before we could procure crews for a dozen sail of the line by Impressment; and the very event which Lord Althorp dreads might happen by the abandonment, would be the certain consequence of the retention of the system, even were it tolerated, namely, that they would get the start of us, as they have always done, scour the seas, insult our shores, attack our colonies, and destroy millions worth of our merchants' property before we were prepared to encounter them with equal force: and hence the necessity for our possessing a *real, prompt, and efficient* power to call on the *instant service of our seamen*, instead of a *delusive one*, which will assuredly fail us at the moment of need, besides all the other bad consequences attending it."

One of the most remarkable features of the present times is, that we have an Administration composed of men, who, when they sat on the Opposition side of the House, were so frequently and strongly opposed to many of the very measures they now uphold and defend, that they are continually presenting the most tempting occasions, both to public speakers and public writers, to quote their former against their present selves. As one instance among many, we give the following ex-

tract from a speech of Lord Althorp, delivered when a Member of the Opposition, on the 16th of May, 1825, on the House going into a committee on the Navy Estimates. His Lordship then said :

"I next wish to point out some of the evils connected with the practice of Impressment. In the first place I reckon as an evil, the interference with the personal liberty of the seaman (who, at the time of Impressment, was perhaps serving on board a merchant vessel,) and the circumstance of his being deprived of his right to choose the nature of his employment. Another evil is, that seamen who, at the breaking out of a war, happen not to be on board ships in the merchant service, are obliged to hide themselves (as if they had committed crimes and offences against the law) for the purpose of avoiding Impressment. It is melancholy to reflect, that a class of men on whom our greatness as a country chiefly depends, should be placed in as great difficulties as criminals, and obliged to conceal themselves in the best manner they can. Again—and this is no trifling or inconsiderable evil—our seamen on board ships (having been compelled to serve) are obliged to be watched in order to be retained in the service into which they have been forced to enter. They seldom or never can obtain leave of absence, and at times, during the late war, the indulgence was prohibited altogether; it being, doubtless, apprehended, that if the men received leave of absence they would desert. If a boat came on shore, it was necessary to watch the sailors lest they should abscond. These circumstances, which are very disadvantageous, may be removed in a considerable degree."

To revert to the question of Registration, and the failure of the Registering Bill of William the Third, in addition to the statements made on this subject in the speech contained in our last Number, page 203, the following facts are deserving attention. It was said that the seamen were then disgusted with the naval service, and refused to register because they deemed it only a trap to ensnare them the more easily. They published a variety of hand-bills and papers, at the time, one of which is so short, so pithy, and so remarkable, that it is worth giving here. It was as follows :

"All Gentlemen Seamen who are weary of their lives, and desire to serve King William, on board the Navy Royal, shall have, for encouragement, *fair promises*, and NO PERFORMANCES, as follows: to each able seaman twenty-four shillings per month, to be paid when he can get it: and TO BE HANGED WHEN HE DEMANDS IT!"

A song was also written by some of them, and extensively circulated, copies of which have been preserved, and of which the following are three of the most remarkable stanzas—

But now, suppose they *had* done ill  
In asking pay too roughly—still  
When 'twas their *due*, and need so pressed,  
They might have *pardon* found at least;  
The King and Queen some "*gracious*" call,  
But seamen found no "*grace*" at all.

To robbers, thieves, and felons, they  
Freely grant pardons, every day;  
Only poor seamen, who alone  
Do keep them on their father's throne,  
Must have at all no mercy shown.

God bless our noble Parliament,  
And give *them* the whole government,  
For England's sinking—unless they  
Do take the helm and better sway.

Bishop Burnet, in the "*History of his own Times*," says, that in the

year 1703 there were great complaints respecting the provisions of the fleet; which were so bad, that many seamen were actually poisoned thereby. The seamen who had registered under this act were promised forty shillings a-year as a retaining fee, to command their services in times of need; but they were also to pay sixpence a-month of their wages while in the merchant service towards the support of the Greenwich Hospital. So infamously however were the seamen treated, that the sixpences were exacted with the greatest rigour from their monthly pay, while the promised forty-shillings a-year was never paid for seven years in succession! Added to this, when they were paid their nominal wages due for serving in the navy, instead of money, they were paid by tickets, acknowledging the amount due to them; which could only be turned into ready cash through brokers and money changers, and at a discount of fifty per cent., like the prize money tickets in more recent times. All this was surely enough to account for the universal disgust felt towards the naval service, and the unwillingness of seamen to register themselves for broken promises, no pay, bad provisions, and hanging for demanding their rights!

The authorities of men not connected with the Naval Service have not been quoted: though in a great question of humanity like this there seems no reason why they should not be referred to. Under this impression we select a few only. The following is from the pen of David Hume the historian, and will be found in his Tenth Essay on some Remarkable Customs:

"The third custom which we propose to remark regards England; and though it be not so important as those we have pointed out in Athens and Rome, is no less singular and unexpected. It is a maxim in politics that we readily admit as undisputed and universal, that a power, however great, when granted by law to an eminent magistrate, is not so dangerous to liberty as an authority, however inconsiderable, which he acquires from violence and usurpation. For besides that the law always limits every power which it bestows, the very receiving it as a concession establishes the authority whence it is derived, and preserves the harmony of the constitution.

"By the same right that one prerogative is assumed without law, another may also be claimed, and another with still greater facility; while the first usurpations both serve as precedents to the following, and give force to maintain them. Hence the heroism of Hampden's conduct, who sustained the whole violence of Royal persecution rather than pay a tax of twenty shillings not imposed by Parliament; hence the care of all English patriots to guard against the first encroachments of the Crown; and hence alone the existence at this day of English liberty.

"There is, however, one occasion when the Parliament has departed from this maxim; and that is in the *pressing of Seamen*. The exercise of an irregular power is here tacitly permitted in the Crown; and though it has frequently been under deliberation how that power might be rendered legal, and granted, under proper restrictions, to the Sovereign, no safe expedient has ever been proposed for that purpose, and the danger to liberty always appeared greater from law than from usurpation. While this power is exercised to no other end than to man the navy, men willingly submit to it, and find nobody to support them in claiming the rights and privileges which the law grants, without distinction, to all English subjects. But were this power on any occasion made an instrument of faction, or ministerial tyranny, the opposite faction, and indeed all lovers of their country, would immediately take the alarm, and support the injured party: the liberty of Englishmen would be asserted; juries would be implacable; and the tools of tyranny, acting both against law and equity, would meet with the severest vengeance. On the other hand, were the Parliament to grant such an authority, they would probably fall into one of two inconveniences—they would either bestow it under so many restrictions as would make it lose its effect by cramping

the authority of the Crown; or they would render it so large and comprehensive as might give occasion to great abuses, for which we could in that case have no remedy. The very irregularity of the practice prevents its abuses, by affording so easy a remedy against them.

"I pretend not by this reasoning to exclude all possibility of contriving a register of seamen which might man the navy without being dangerous to liberty, I only observe that no satisfactory scheme of that nature has been yet proposed. Rather than adopt any project hitherto invented (for manning the navy), we continue a practice seemingly the most absurd and unaccountable. Authority in times of full and internal peace, is armed against law. A continued violence is permitted in the Crown, amidst the greatest jealousy and watchfulness in the people; nay, proceeding from those very principles, liberty is left entirely to its own defence without any countenance or protection. The wild state of nature is renewed, in one of the most civilized societies of mankind; and great violence and disorder are committed with impunity; while the one party pleads obedience to the supreme magistrate, the other the sanction of fundamental laws."

The able author of the Letters on Impressment, before referred to, having compiled in a manuscript, which we hope may, ere long, be given to the public in a printed form, a great variety of curious particulars connected with this subject, we subjoin only one, containing an account of a conversation between the celebrated Dr. Johnson and that eminent advocate for the abolition of Slavery, Granville Sharpe, with the writer's observations thereon. The account is as follows:

In the year 1778, Granville Sharpe, the philanthropist, published his celebrated "Address to the People of England." This gentleman was a decided enemy to Slavery in every shape, and proved himself so able a champion for the abolition of the horrid Coast of Guinea Negro Trade then carried on, as to have endeared his memory to all mankind. He was rewarded with the praise and thanks of his own generation, and at his death a monument was erected in Westminster Abbey, by the African Slave Suppression Society, to mark their veneration for his memory. The pamphlet in question treats largely on the illegality, as well as the impolicy, and inhumanity of pressing seamen, and he labours to show that it is a practice not tolerated by our ancestors, bringing forward many cases in proof of his opinion, and roundly asserting, that it was justifiable homicide to put any man to death in resisting the exercise of it. In conjunction with General Oglethorpe, he appears to have used every endeavour to bring the question fairly before the courts of law, but was always baffled by the manœuvring of the judges, as I have shown in my eleventh letter. The Life of Sharpe was published by Mr. Prince Hoare, in 1820, and in that biography many curious letters and memorandums of transactions relating to pressing seamen will be found. Amongst others, there is the following, from his diary of May 20, 1779, which I here insert, as it records the opinion of the celebrated Dr. Johnson on this subject.

"Called on Dr. Johnson. Had a long debate with him about the legality of pressing seamen. He said it was a condition necessarily attending their way of life, and when they entered upon it, they must take it with all its circumstances, and knowing this, it must be considered as voluntary service, like an innkeeper, who knows himself liable to have soldiers quartered upon him."

It is astonishing that a man of Dr. Johnson's capacious mind should have reasoned on such a syllogism as this, or drawn so puerile and inapplicable a comparison. We must attribute it to the bigoted notions and prejudices for which he was notorious (his party defended the system); and also, that in the whole range of British subjects he could find no better parallel. The innkeeper, besides being paid the value (annually adjusted according to the prices of provisions, &c., by the Mutiny Bill\*) for what he provides for soldiers billeted

\* By an act passed 21st July, 1806, the innkeeper's allowance for billeted soldiers, was doubled in consequence of the enhanced price of provisions.

upon him, *can, at his option adopt any other trade* (for his person and property is free, and his habits of business and ready made connexion will suit him for several), if he does not choose to incur the obligations to which keeping an inn makes him liable. But the *mariner cannot*, for if once proved guilty of having been to sea, the press-gang can take him wherever he may be, or in whatever occupation, even if driving his carriage on his estate, or enveloped in the judicial robes of a mayor of a corporate town, and magistrates are actually authorized and commanded by several statutes to hunt him out, and pay rewards to the constables who find and secure him. Again, a sailor *does not choose his trade in nine cases out of ten*, and the assertion that this adoption of a profession and its liabilities, make a forced service voluntary, is a piece of special logic worthy of Foster's celebrated argument, from which it is borrowed. A boy is placed at sea when too young to have a will of his own, much less to choose his trade; whereas the publican always adopts his from choice. Besides, there is an absolute necessity that soldiers in marching about should be lodged somewhere, and public-houses are the most suitable places, where no barracks exist. The allowance that Government assigns may be too little, in that case the remedy is easy, by augmenting it; but it is very questionable whether there *really exists a necessity* for pressing seamen, many people deny it altogether, and at all events it should not be resorted to, until, as Lord Chatham declared "*after all inducements to enter, and the tender of the full value of their labour had failed.*" Militiamen have been instanced as being compelled to serve; but in their case again, there is no analogy with seamen, for they are not compelled to quit the kingdom, or to expose their persons against an enemy, *unless he invades our shores*; whereas the mariner is pressed out of his peaceable calling, in a trading ship, and sent to seek for blows in all parts of the world. The militia-man's service is limited to seven years, he can procure a substitute in such service for a reasonable price, and he is paid as much as his labour is worth. Besides, that being drawn out of the whole population, there is great chance of escaping altogether. There is nothing of this kind in the case of seamen, every one of whom is hunted out, and to avoid serving he must find two substitutes in the shape of able seamen, at a cost of 80*l.* or 100*l.*; and even then his protection does not always secure him, for he may be pressed at the will of an officer afloat, and although the act would not be countenanced, it would be long ere the forms of obtaining his liberty could be gone through. There is no possibility of a militia-man incurring these and many other hazards, therefore no comparison can be drawn between the liabilities of the two. In fact, there is *no other class* of subjects under such obligations, neither *could they be enforced on any but this frigidless body of men*, who deserve very different treatment at the hands of their countrymen.

The feelings of the religious community of England were powerfully and universally arrayed against the continuance of Slavery in our Colonies; and by the well-organized and constant efforts made by them, they ultimately prevailed in obtaining an act that fixes a period at least for its expiration. But they have not yet lifted up their voices against Impressment as a religious community; though they will perceive that one of their "*burning and shining lights,*" the late revered and honoured Dr. Adam Clarke, many years ago, in one of his voyages from America to Liverpool, felt as strong an indignation against Impressment as he ever did against Slavery, and expressed himself in becoming terms. On the ship in which he was a passenger taking on board the pilot who was to guide them into the Mersey, they were informed that there was then a hot press going on in the river. There were two young men, one a sailor, the other a hatter, steerage passengers, who began to fear for their personal safety. The sloop entered the river, and the first object that attracted their attention was a Tender, which fired a couple of guns to make the captain bring-to. The sails



were hauled down in a moment, and the Tender lowered her boat over her side; an officer and six men entered it, and began to make for the sloop. The transaction now about to be recorded Dr. Clarke has often related. His own account is the following:

"As soon as Captain Cunningham perceived the Tender, and was obliged to *bring-to* on her fire, he addressed himself to the passengers, and said, "You had better go and hide yourselves in the most secret parts of the vessel, or wherever you can, we shall have a press-gang immediately on board; and I cannot protect you." The two young men already mentioned hid themselves accordingly. I said to myself, *Shall such a man as I flee?* I will not. I am in the hands of the Lord. If he permit me to be sent on board a man-of-war, doubtless he has something for me to do there. I therefore quietly sat down on a locker in the cabin, and my heart prayed to the God of Heaven. By and by the noise on deck told me that the press-gang was come on board. Immediately I heard a hoarse voice of unholy authority calling out. 'All you who are below, come upon deck!' I immediately walked up the hatchway, stepped across the quarter-deck, and leaned against the gunwhale. The officer went down himself, and searched, and found the *hatter*, but he found not the *sailor*." While this officer and the Captain were in conversation about the *hatter*, who maintained that he was apprenticed to Mr. —, of Liverpool, one of the gang came up to me, and said to one of our sailors, 'Who have we got here? Oh, he's a — priest, I'll warrant,' said the fellow, 'we pressed a priest yesterday, but I think we'll not take this one.' By this time the Lieutenant having ordered the poor *hatter* on board the Tender's boat, came up to me, stood for some seconds eyeing me from head to foot; he then stepped forward, took me by the right hand, fingered and thumbed it, to find whether I had been brought up to the sea or to hard labour; then with authoritative insolence, shook it from him with a muffled execration, 'D—n you, you'll not do.' They then returned to their boat, and went off with the poor *hatter*. What Briton's bosom does not burn against this infringement of British liberty! This unconstitutional attack on the liberty of a free-born subject of the sovereign of the British Isles. While the impress service is tolerated, in vain do we boast of our Constitution. It is an attack upon its vitality, ten thousand times worse than any suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* act. Let Britons know that it is not any part of our Constitution, nor any law of the land, whatever some venal lawyers have said, in order to make it *constructively* such. Nothing can be a reason for it, but that which justifies a *lever en masse* of the inhabitants of the nation. It is intolerable to hear those plead for it who are not exposed to so great a calamity."—Vol i, p. 143.

The evils of the system in a pecuniary point of view, and in its pressure on the shipowners in the merchant service, were dwelt on at great length in the debate of last Session; as well as its demoralizing effect in every point of view. On this subject, however, we received, only a few days ago, a short letter from an old commander at one of the ports in Wales, which is so short, so recent, and so much to the purpose, that we cannot refrain from inserting it here. The writer says:

"As your mind is powerfully directed to the advocating the abolition of the iniquitous system of impressment, I doubt not you are aware of the magnitude of the evils inflicted by it on the Commerce of the country, as well as the aggravated injustice to the poor seamen themselves, and its ineffectiveness to accomplish the object. Yet, as I do not recollect that you advert to this branch of the subject, I am induced to mention some of the injuries it has caused to the mercantile interests, and which I have myself experienced.

"The immediate consequence of Impressment was the infamous *Crimping System*. The sailors, from the fear of the press-gang, became the unhappy victims of these unprincipled harpies, called *Crimps*. It was the business of the *Crimp*, by every artifice and exertion, to get seamen, on their return from a voyage, into their power; in some cases, they even boarded the vessels in the Channel, took out

those men who were liable to be impressed, and put on board protected men to assist in bringing the vessel into the river. The seamen were conveyed to their private lodging-houses, where they kept them concealed, till not only they had stripped them of all their wages, but too often fraudulently made them appear in debt, when they exacted monthly notes to receive part of their wages on the following voyage, or they would sometimes betray and sell them to the press-gang. Having arrived at this stage, the Crimp had to find an outward-bound ship ready to receive her crew, and he then bargained with the Captain or Shipowner, to procure them sailors at a stipulated price. I have paid 2*l.* a head for a crew, and for a few hands from 3*l.* to 5*l.* It may be fairly considered that the expense of manning a West Indianman was equal to a month's wages. The great difficulty of procuring sailors under these circumstances tended greatly to increase the rate of wages; if I recollect right, 45*s.* to 50*s.* a-month was given.

"The Shipowner experienced another great inconvenience and loss. He was obliged to take a great many apprentices, to assist in navigating his vessels; they were protected by their indenture for three years, but they had scarcely acquired enough knowledge on board ship, to be useful, when they were beguiled away by the Crimps, who shipped them in other vessels as seamen. Then again the enormous demoralization that was caused by having recourse to every possible means to deceive the press-gangs, false indentures—false American protections—swearing to papers under fictitious names, &c. I have known men protected by false American papers during the whole war. If all the loss and mischief inflicted on the Commerce of the country were fairly estimated, it would be alone enough to prevent any man, who rightly considered the interest of his country, from upholding the impressing of seamen."

As to instances of individual hardship and suffering, arising out of the system, a volume might be as easily filled as a page. We content ourselves, however, with giving the following narrative, as one only out of a thousand which we might record; and we give it the preference over every other, because it is the most recent in point of date. On the very morning of the day in which the debate was to come on, on Tuesday, March 4, a gentleman from the Seamen's Bethel Society, in Wellclose-square, called on us with a petition from the principal director of that establishment, the Rev. Mr. Smith, and being accompanied by an old weather-beaten tar, who had walked up from the east end of the town, to accompany the bringer of the petition, his appearance excited so much sympathy, that his history was made the subject of inquiry, and the following particulars were gathered from his own lips:

This veteran seaman, named Martin Adge, now upwards of seventy-two years of age, was first impressed from a merchant ship in which he was serving as second mate, at the wages of 4*l.* 10*s.* per month, and placed on board a King's ship at 22*s.* 6*d.* a-month. He would not enter, and therefore never received the bounty. He served, however, for twenty-two years, during which time he was engaged in the battle of the North Sea under Admiral Duncan; at the taking of St. Lucie in the West Indies; was wounded in the *Courageux* severely in the head, the scars of which he bears, with many other smaller ones; was wrecked in the *Heron* sloop of war, and narrowly escaped death; was again cast away in the *Invincible* 74, and picked up, with a few others only of the crew, by boats while on the point of sinking; and was all this time engaged in active and perilous service for his country. Not many years after his first impressment, he was made boatswain's mate of the *Maria*, a press-gang tender; and having, in that station, to inflict the punishment of flogging, his nature so revolted at the constant drawing of his fellow-countrymen's blood, by

the lash of the murderous cat, that he ran from the service altogether. He was soon afterwards, however, pressed again; and after filling up the remainder of the twenty-two years' service in different ships, without ever receiving the bounty, he was ultimately paid off from the Sicilia, with excellent testimonials of character from several officers under whom he had served. Strenuous endeavours have been made to get him into Greenwich Hospital, or to have some small pension allowed him, but in vain: the single fact of the letter R being placed against his name, as having *run* from the tender at an early part of his service, though he was again impressed and served many years afterwards, depriving him of all claim; and he is therefore now, at the age of seventy-two, after all his battles, wrecks, and sufferings, subsisting on casual charity, and passes many times a whole day without tasting food!

Let this be contrasted with the Pension List, on which so many noble and titled idlers are subsisting in luxury, without having risked a hair in their country's service, or passed a night out of a warm feather bed, and the impression must be painful to every humane and honourable mind. But it would be endless to pursue this theme. We therefore restrain our feelings, though it is quite impossible entirely to suppress them.

In conclusion, then, we subjoin some of the most striking articles that we have seen in the public journals on this subject, in which we have a double object: the first is, to place on record, in this collected form, for future reference, when the question shall be again discussed, (as it must be on every fitting opportunity, until it is entirely carried,) the facts and arguments which most powerfully expose the evil, and point out the remedy; and the second is, to encourage, by this wide and general diffusion of the sentiments of the leading journals of the metropolis, all those friends of British seamen at the outports and inland towns who take an interest in their cause, to persevere to the end, as their victory is merely a question of time, and the sooner they can achieve it, the longer will they live to enjoy their triumph.

The following are the articles we have selected from the journals we have seen, the name and date of which will be found appended to each.

THE TIMES.—THE principles and feelings expressed in the debate on the impressment of seamen, reported in our paper, were most satisfactory. We cannot say the same for the vote by which the discussion was terminated. Till impressment be declared illegal, unless upon occasions in which extraordinary circumstances would justify a suspension of all law, we can never be secured against its terrors on sailors, or its damage to the mercantile service of the country. With a case of extreme necessity, or of overwhelming state of danger from foreign enemies, like that which would warrant the suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* act in civil life, we have nothing to do. A legislature ought not to provide for extreme cases, nor ought a government to retain privileges which contemplate the occurrence of such cases as ordinary events. On this ground we dissent from the plan of Sir James Graham, though probably no former First Lord of the Admiralty ever delivered himself with a more liberal spirit, or showed more enlightened zeal to correct a despotic practice. The registration of seamen in the merchant service, for the purpose of being enabled to draught from that body by ballot a supply for our national navy in case of a war, might certainly diminish the arbitrary injustice of a press-warrant against the merchant crews of particular ports, but would only go a small way in removing the evil. Besides, the registration itself would, in this case, be reckoned a kind of exposure to penalty, and would either be evaded altogether, or complied with reluctantly, as a kind of marine conscription. The practice of

training boys for the naval service, which the enlightened administration of the Admiralty has already commenced—the general feeling that a little better treatment, and a little more indulgence, would have their effect in procuring sufficient volunteers of a better class;—and the opinion of several naval men of high character, particularly of the honourable admiral who spoke on the question, seem to us to be decisive of the question at issue between the original mover and the government. As the question, however, does not seem to be finally set at rest on the side which has the most argument in its favour, we make no apology for inserting the following observations which were written before the debate, in order to promote its object, but which were omitted on Tuesday for want of room.

It would appear to us a work of most perfect supererogation to prove that the forcible impressment of seamen at the commencement of a war is incompatible with the institutions of a free state—that it is contrary to every idea of good faith, impartial justice, or political morality—that it is a legalized outrage on the personal liberty and civil rights of those who become its victims, for the alleged benefit of the nation, which should afford equal protection to all—that it is an act of arbitrary despotism, committed on the plea of a pressing necessity—that it inflicts irreparable wrong and unmerited oppression on persons accused of no crime, and therefore amenable to no punishment—and that both in the manner of its commission, and in the tortures by which it is followed, it amounts, in barbarity, to the most cruel excesses of the most barbarous people. All or the most of these points will be readily conceded. Indeed, they cannot easily be denied. It cannot be pretended that the operation of impressment resembles in any feature a military conscription, draughted equally and impartially from the whole body of the population, for the general defence of the state. It appears, on the contrary, to be the arbitrary seizure and cruel detention of individuals belonging to a particular class, for the security of their fellow citizens, who offer them neither indemnity nor compensation. It cannot be said that it is ordered or authorized by any law to which the consent of the nation has been deliberately given, for though, like slavery, it has been recognized by statutes which exempt certain descriptions of persons from its operation, it seems founded on no positive or deliberative act of the legislature.

The feelings of the people accord with this idea of its violation of all legal and constitutional right. A press-warrant is looked upon by them as an instrument of more than Algerine violence, though issued by a free government, perhaps for the preservation of liberty. A press-gang (the object of more terror than a pestilence) is regarded as a body of legalized brigands or pirates, armed for the capture of their own countrymen; and the state to which the latter consign their victims on board of our war-ships, and subject to their torturing punishments, appears more hateful than even captivity among the Barbarous infidels. The man-stealers and negro-kidnappers on the coast of Africa, during the most cruel activity of the slave trade, could not excite greater alarm among the natives than is excited by the appearance of a squadro in one of our ports, when its crews require to be recruited by an impressment. The terror which it inspires has been manifested in the difficulty of procuring sailors to our merchant service when thus exposed—in the exorbitant wages with which trade was obliged to tempt them—and in the eagerness with which *protections* of all kinds against the hands of violence were sought after and prized.

But the plea on which the practice of impressment has hitherto been defended is supposed sufficient to counterbalance all the hostile feelings arrayed against it. It has been contended, that though a great, it is a necessary evil, and that we must abandon the hope of maintaining our naval superiority if we consent to act on the principles of humanity and justice in procuring a regular supply of sailors for manning our fleets by voluntary enlistment at the outbreak of a war. At a peace, it is said, we may reduce our establishment from 120,000 seamen to 20,000 or 30,000. We still retain the ships and officers for the larger force, or for the war establishment. A war suddenly occurs, ships must be sent on distant expeditions, and we cannot entrust the trident of the ocean to a less force than held it before. There is no time for training sailors to a seafaring life. We must therefore take them ready made from the merchant service, in which they have become acquainted with the element on which they are to fight, if not with the arms which they are to employ. Press-warrants must therefore be issued, press-gangs must be set in motion, and for the sake of the national security, or to gain national glory, we must interrupt the trade and outrage the feelings of the country.

This reasoning would have great force, if it left no alternative between the necessity of impressment and a decline in our naval superiority; but if it can be proved that no such alternative exists—that our fleet on all conceivable emergencies might

be manned by voluntary supplies—if it can be proved even that impressment is the source of most of the evils of which we have to complain in the discipline of our navy—that it keeps up a spirit of perpetual irritation and distrust between the men and their commanders—that it renders perhaps indispensable severe and brutalizing punishments—that it prevents their officers from granting those indulgencies to our brave defenders which they would be disposed to grant except for the danger of desertion—that it compels them to confine them to their ships, when they might be allowed to visit their friends, and transact their business on shore, lest they might run away if allowed to land—that it induced them in the last war to desert to the Americans, and thus embroiled us with that great naval power in questions respecting the right of search for recovering the crews of our own ships ;—if it can be shown that it deteriorates the character of our commercial navy—that it prevents a better class of persons from adopting a seafaring life, lest they should be subjected to this species of captivity—that it enhances the wages of our sailors according to their fears of the press-gang, and thus becomes a burden on our trade ;—if it can be shown that the merchant service is not necessarily a nursery for our military navy, but that as good sailors can be formed when they are brought up in no such nursery, and that much is to be learnt that can only be taught on board a King's ship ;—if it can be proved that it would be more economical to maintain a fleet in peace with a sufficient number of men fit for manning it in war than to resort to impressment when war is declared ;—if, we say, all these positions can be established, we can scarcely imagine how the most ardent admirer of “ the wisdom of our ancestors,” or the most zealous supporter of our naval superiority, could hesitate a moment in consenting to a proposition for abolishing impressment.

We need scarcely say, though we have here put the question hypothetically, and have not at present room to enter on the details of the reasoning, that every one of those points has been established on the most satisfactory grounds. A pamphlet displaying talent, good feeling, and good sense, written by Lieutenant Standish Hailey, of the Royal Navy, and published so long ago as 1822, has proved several of the above positions in a convincing and undeniable manner. He has proved in his own words, “ that the greatest curse which can hang over the destiny of an English sailor is impressment : he has shown that there is not a bad feature in the character of sailors that may not be traced to this vile origin ; that it is not necessary for the manning our navy, and that consequently it ought to be abolished.” He has proposed a plan by which volunteers can be gained in sufficient numbers by rewarding their services, and providing against their wants in old age. He has proved that as good sailors may be formed in the royal navy as in the merchant service ; and therefore that it is not necessary to pass through the latter in order to become efficient in the former. His authority, as that of a naval man, is great on these and other professional points, on which he has given us the benefit of his opinions or suggestions.

With respect to the point of economy, which, after all, has hitherto formed the chief obstacle to the abolition of impressment, an excellent note by Mr. McCulloch, in his edition of Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, has set the question at rest. In this note it is shown that losses to a greater amount are incurred to the nation by the high wages which the shipping interest are obliged during war to offer, in order to obtain seamen to work their vessels, with the terrors of impressment staring them in the face, than would be occasioned by the maintenance, during peace, of a sufficient number of sailors to answer the immediate purposes of government on the outbreak of a war. This is quite independent of the damage often sustained in cases where sailors' wages are high, by sending ships to sea with insufficient crews, and thus exposing life and property to loss. It is likewise independent of that great prospective danger which we must expect to encounter in any new naval war, from the desertion of our impressed seamen to the Americans, where they will find that protection which they could not find under their own government, or expose their country to engage a new enemy, in endeavouring to reclaim them.—*March 6.*

*THE GLOBE.*—Mr. Buckingham's motion for an inquiry into the practicability of procuring a supply of men for the navy without resorting to impressment, was brought forward by him with great ability and persuasiveness, and made a strong impression in the house. The motion probably would have been carried but for the confidence entertained that Sir James Graham would make every effort to attain the same object which Mr. Buckingham's motion was directed to.

There is, there can be but one object in the view of all parties, viz., to relieve the sailor from oppression if it be possible to do so without detriment to our naval power.

And then this question naturally suggests itself, can it possibly be advantageous to our naval power to oppress the class, by the number and spirit of which that power is maintained?

There are two expedients which are to be combined for superseding the necessity of impressment. The first is to improve the condition of the seamen of the King's navy; the second, to register the merchants' seamen, and to ballot from them for the supply of the navy in case of emergency.

As to the first of these expedients there can be no difference of opinion: everything which draws men into the navy as a pleasant and honourable service, must lessen the pretence for compelling them; but the plan of balloting for seamen, though it is an improvement on impressment, still partakes of the vices, and carries with it some of the bad consequences of impressment; and the necessity of ~~some~~ such scheme, and even an occasional resort to impressment, seems to have been too readily admitted on all sides.

There is one truth which, though sufficiently obvious, is not kept steadily enough in view in the discussions on impressment. The difficulty which is felt is, that the demand for the King's navy being added at the breaking out of a war to the ordinary demand for men in the merchant service, while the number of seamen remains the same, there *must* be a dearth of men, which must produce some inconvenience. But ~~that~~ certain, the indisputable truth is, that impressment cannot by possibility increase the number of seamen—on the contrary, it may and does diminish it. As often happens in every scramble, much of that which is scrambled for is lost. Very considerable numbers of seamen betake themselves to foreign parts—some even hide themselves, or take to other occupations in inland towns. If provisions were scarce in a town, should we secure a supply by plundering those who bring the provisions to market, or compelling them to sell on unfair terms? Yet because there is a scarcity of maritime skill, we oppress and ill treat those who possess it. We extort from them services (when we catch them) on unfair terms, so that the natural temporary dearth of seamen is aggravated into a famine.

This power of impressment not only causes an increased scarcity at the moment when it comes into operation, but it causes an habitual scarcity—an under supply of men in the navy at other times. It is a tax and discouragement on the calling of the sailor, by subjecting him to a risk of annoyance which a man in another pursuit would not be exposed to. The opposite of this is surely the true policy of a maritime state. There should be peculiar bounties, not peculiar taxes on seamen, so that as compared with other occupations, seamanship should be somewhat overstocked.

If seamen in the merchants' service be registered, and all of them—the old and the young, the married as well as the single—be subject to be balloted for, this will still be a hardship and a discouragement; it will *tend*, though not so much as impressment, to make seamen scarce and dear. What is wanted is the power of getting a supply of seamen on an emergency—on the breaking out of a war. Why should not the attempt be made to accomplish this object, as is done in all other cases, by contract, and to make this contract an encouragement to the merchant service? If the Admiralty were to proclaim that they were ready to pay 10*l.* a year for ten years to any able-bodied seamen, between the ages of 20 and 25, who would contract to enter and serve in the navy on the breaking out of a war within that period, leaving them free in the meantime to serve in the merchants' service, would there be any difficulty in obtaining a considerable number of the best seamen to contract on these terms? If ten pounds would not induce them to enter, twenty would: such a bounty would tend to induce a number of young men to qualify themselves for this retaining pension—which, if only given to perfectly well qualified seamen, might be honourable as well as profitable.

A contract of this kind, while it would be the just and natural mode of obtaining men for the royal navy, would operate as a bounty on entering the merchant service. It would be thus the opposite of impressment. At any rate this is clear,—that the impossibility of dispensing with impressment never can be established until some means of supplying the navy by voluntary contract have been tried.—*March 6.*

THE COURIER.—We are happy to express our accordance with the *Times* in the opinion that no First Lord of the Admiralty ever delivered himself with a more liberal spirit, or shewed more enlightened zeal to correct a despotic practice; still we deeply regret that Sir James Graham, and the patriotic administration to which he belongs, should have lost the opportunity of gaining honour by conceding voluntarily a prerogative—if the crown have the prerogative to commit outrage on a class of the people—which we think, with Mr. Buckingham, the crown will not

be suffered again to exercise. Can Sir James Graham, or can his Majesty's Ministers dream for a moment—when they see nations, the most liberal and free, shaken almost to dissolution by the petty hardships of a tariff—when they see society in Ireland torn asunder by resistance to paying a few pounds of money, and the few vexations of the tithe system—when they themselves are obliged to concede part of the assessed taxes to the acknowledged unpopularity of those taxes;—can they then dream that the seamen who share in the general knowledge and feelings of the community, will submit to evils and wrongs to which the vexations of a tariff, the infliction of the tithes, or the surcharges of the collectors, are light and pleasant? Nor should we think the country could safely trust the seamen to protect it, if they had not the courage and the spirit to resist. What could their most implacable foreign foe do worse to them than carry them off as prisoners, and compel them, by flogging and the dread of a bayonet, to work and to fight? We believe, therefore, that the prerogative which Sir James Graham defended, cannot again, with the least chance even of success, be exercised; and though he may deserve, by his concessions, the praise of great liberality as compared to former First Lords of the Admiralty, he shewed very little of the spirit of this age, and very little prospective wisdom, when he insisted on retaining in his hand the scourge which he may not use.

Let it be remembered, that the want is of seamen for men of war, at the commencement of a war. That want alone, and none other—for the want of them during the continuance of the war is not held to be a justification of impressment—is the source of the alleged necessity for impressment. Sir James Graham has begun to remedy this want by entering a thousand youths in men of war, who will, in the course of a few months, or a year, be tolerably good seamen. Why not extend that system?—why not make seamen during peace? The want is of men-of-war's seamen, at the breaking out of a war, and, of course, our ships during peace should be a nursery for those seamen, to the greatest extent possible, consistent with what is due in point of economy to the tax payers. On looking, however, to the navy estimates, we find no less a sum than 177,350*l.*, for the charge of seamen—no, of *marines*, on shore. This is exclusive of a corresponding sum which the country has to pay for *marines*, not seamen, afloat. Here then, we have, about 350,000*l.*, employed in making our ships a nursery, not of seamen, but of soldiers. Here is the principle of our proposition. We are quite sure, from the wages of labour on shore—from the great want of employment in every business—from the known and avowed fact, that men, if paid sufficiently, may always be got for any service, however difficult—that the navy may now get as many seamen, or as many youths to convert into seamen, as it requires, and we, therefore, would discharge and disband the 9,000 soldiers, and we would hire the services, now that it is peace, of 9,000 young men to be brought up as seamen. The barracks and clothing of the soldiers might of course be dispensed with, saving the country at present about 18,000*l.*, a year, and during war about three times that sum, and giving it 27,000 seamen, instead of 18,000 seamen and 9,000 marines.

Let us not be terrified out of our senses, and led to commit an injustice by such statements as that of Captain Elliott, or such nonsense as we grieve to say Sir James Graham uttered a few nights ago about wanting the whole navy in six days. In the present state of the civilized world, there is not the slightest probability of our wanting double the number of 27,000 seamen in three weeks or a month. No foreign power, of whom we can entertain any dread, can bring forward a fleet to endanger us in less time than that, and no foreign power can fit out ships without our being immediately informed of the first blow of the hammer. Well, then, having our 27,000 seamen, suppose we should be threatened by France, or Russia, or America, we would divide those men into double the number of ships; they would, of course, be well disciplined men-of-war's men. We would add to them in each ship a company of soldiers, to be withdrawn as seamen could be obtained, and we would trust to voluntary enlistment to fill up the crews. We are confident that in less than a month we should have at least 50,000 men afloat, and far more efficient men than the offscourings of the streets or the pinioned pressed men which the present system obtains. We should like to know what other naval power could have 50,000 seamen at sea in a month? We are sure that men are so plentiful, that no scheme or contrivance is required to obtain them—that no expensive registration is needed—that we have nothing to do—such a glad occupation is sea-going—but to deprive our ships of the characteristics of a prison, by removing the armed sentinels from their gangways,—we have nothing to do but to employ only seamen during peace, and the fleet will never want seamen during war.—March 6.

*The Times* say.—The manner in which Ministers met the motion of Mr. Bucking-

ham, on the question of impressment, is not calculated to elevate their characters in public estimation. It is true, they have not met the question, as a Tory government would in all probability have met it—by a flat negative, a positive refusal to do any thing, a direct assertion of the expediency or necessity of the system, and a plain avowal of a determination to support it to the last; but neither have they done that, which in an age like this, an enlightened English government ought to be prepared, and must naturally be expected to do. Mr. Buckingham moves for “a select committee to take into consideration the practicability of devising some plan by which a regular and voluntary supply of seamen may be procured for his Majesty’s navy, without recourse to the practice of forcible impressment.” A committee to consider of the practicability of devising such a plan, might surely have been granted with safety, and ought to have been assented to without hesitation; but instead of conceding this, and thereby giving the country an assurance of sincerity and manly dealing upon this deeply interesting subject, Ministers set themselves to work to devise various doubtful plans and evasive expedients—to make all sorts of promises and protestations—as if with a resolution not to be direct and straight-forward, and as if with a purpose of maintaining a character for shuffling and insincerity.

The proposition of Sir James Graham is commented upon by the *Times* of to-day, in an article of exceeding power of argument, and of exceeding earnestness of feeling. As our contemporary truly says, the question of impressment is far from being set at rest on that side which had the most argument in its favour. Nobody can doubt that, who has read even in a cursory way the very admirable speech with which Mr. Buckingham opened this important discussion. No one who has examined the masterly arguments of the hon. member for Sheffield, whether as they respect the “legality” or the morality of the system of forcible impressment, can hesitate for an instant to believe that it is a system whose gratuitous barbarity marks it out for final, and we trust speedy extinction. We particularly refer all those in whom a wise spirit of humanity prompts an earnest wish for the removal of the deep stain which impressment casts upon the character of England, to Mr. Buckingham’s unanswered, and, we believe, unanswerable speech. That gentleman, by the way, has been upon several occasions very ungraciously treated by the honourable house, of which so many thousands out of doors believe him to be a most honourable member; but he had an opportunity upon this occasion of forcing his hearers to do him justice, and he extorted even from his principal opponent an acknowledgment of the candour, moderation, and ability which he brought to his task.

Mr. Buckingham, referring to the surprise expressed last session by Lord Althorp at the institution of a comparison between impressment and slavery, took occasion to justify that comparison, and in doing so put the unjustifiableness, inhumanity, and infamy of impressment, in a remarkably striking light. The passage deserves to be reprinted again and again.

Mr. Buckingham deserves the best thanks of all who are desirous of upholding the real honour of the English navy, and the real interests and glory of the English nation.—*March 6.*

There is one error into which every newspaper that we have yet seen has fallen, namely, that of supposing Sir James Graham’s Registry Bill to embrace a provision for raising seamen for the fleet by a ballot out of the registered men. But those who were in the House during the whole of the debate must remember well, that when Sir James Graham was questioned on this subject, on two separate occasions, once by Mr. Ingham, the member for South Shields, and on the other occasion, by Lord Ormelie, he distinctly admitted that the Bill embraced no such object as that of balloting for the seamen instead of impressing them, nor indeed any other object but that of merely organizing and perfecting a complete registration of all the maritime population of the kingdom. It was this admission, twice repeated, which induced us to say that if the Bill *had* contained any such provision, coupled with a distinct declaration of the illegality and consequent abolition of the practice of Impressment, we should have accepted it as a first step, and given it a fair trial. But no such provisions being either made or



promised, the Bill, however good in itself, as a scheme of registration, did not touch the question of Impressment at all, and could not therefore be accepted as an amendment.

The other error was this; but the *Courier* and the *Spectator* were the only papers we have seen, who fell into it: namely, in supposing that we admitted either the legality or the necessity of Impressment, under any circumstances whatever. We contended, on the contrary, that the power was illegal, and might be lawfully resisted to the death, giving as our authorities for this assertion, Lord Camden, Lord Mansfield, and Lord Coke, and citing cases in which judges and juries had acquitted men for slaying those who attempted to impress them. We contended also that Impressment never could be necessary, if the proper modes of sufficient bounty, adequate wages, limited service, and kind treatment, were tried. On referring to the most accurate report of the debate, we find we used these words.

"The Impressment of men for the navy, except in times of admitted peril, should be declared to be *illegal*;—and if an inevitable necessity should arise, it would be *better* to pass an Order in Council, as for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, *to be repealed when the danger was over*, than to let Impressment be considered the legal rule, and thus warrant resort to it at the discretion of any single captain; though, with a well organized system of a retaining pay for the navy, registering for the merchant seamen, and ballot for the maritime towns, *no such necessity ever could arise*."

Nothing, we think, can be clearer than this, to show that we never admitted either the legality or necessity of Impressment, provided the proper remedies were tried, and in our reply to Sir James Graham, this was again repeated. The passage is thus:—

"The First Lord of the Admiralty had proposed a registration of the merchant seamen of England, which was to be compulsory, or at least to subject to certain disabilities, those who did not act upon it. Now, if this were to be preceded or accompanied by a distinct declaration, that Impressment was not to be resorted to, *except in extreme cases of invasion or insurrection*, and then *under an Order in Council for a limited time*, and with *adequate pay*, he would not object to such a bill, *as a first step to improvement*; or if it had been accompanied by an admission that when the registry was complete, some plan of service, by rotation or ballot, was to be *substituted for Impressment*, he would have consented to its adoption. But without such provisions as these, the bill would never be accepted by the seamen of England as of any value or protection to themselves."

The whole of the reply indeed, negatived the two positions which the newspapers have assumed. But their falling into the two errors pointed out is not, to be wondered at, considering that owing to the lateness of the hour at which the debate was closed, the reply was not given at length in any of the papers, and therefore did not come under the notice of the editors, to correct their misconceptions.

We have now embodied in this article all the facts and arguments, calculated, we think, to place the subject in the clearest point of view; and as we shall probably not revert to the question till it is again brought before Parliament for that final decision, which we are persuaded it will receive in the next debate, when the abolition of Impressment will be triumphantly carried by a large majority, we trust to their indulgence for the length of this article, as we consider it much better to embrace all we thought essential to preserve or place on record in a single article at once, and then let the question rest, than by dividing it into smaller sections, spread it over a larger space of time. This, at least, is our apology, and we trust our readers will readily receive it.

## REFORMS IN THE LAW: LOCAL COURTS.—LORD BROUGHAM, LORD LYNTHURST, MR. WASON.

IN a previous number of *THE PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW*, we expressed our approbation of the contemplated Reforms in Special Pleading; in the present Number we shall give a few short arguments in favour of Local Courts. The advantage of having justice brought home to every man's door has long been apparent. That it should be administered cheaply and expeditiously—that it should neither be dear nor difficult will—we suppose, be conceded to us without dispute. It is with the middle and poorer classes of society that the great majority of triable causes originate. The expenses of witnesses, too often brought from one end of the kingdom to the other, are among the greatest obstacles to the attainment of the poor man's rights. We would, therefore, have ordinary causes tried where the question of litigation arose, generally the residence of the contending parties. We say it is the bounden duty of a good and protective Government to render more convenient the means of obtaining redress, and we see no means more feasible or less objectionable to this end than the institution of District Local Courts.

The best way to preserve all that is valuable in existing legal institutions, is unsparingly to cut off all that is dilatory and cumbrous, to destroy altogether all obsolete and tedious forms. Promptness, summariness, economy of time and money, are all, as essential to the suitor's complete success, as impartiality in the breast of the judge. In small causes in Westminster Hall, the suitor is ruined by his very success. "Another such victory," said an ancient General, "and we are undone." A successful plaintiff in a modern action of paltry amount, may as pointedly exclaim "Another such verdict and Justice has accomplished her worst." This evil arises from the heavy fees demanded in the Superior Courts. There are fees paid in passing the record, fees on entering the cause for trial, Court allowances, and witnesses' expenses.

Another argument in favour of the establishment of Local Courts is, that Justice will thereby be rendered uniform. At present there is no uniformity in Courts of small jurisdiction. No two Courts of Requests throughout the kingdom would be likely to come to the same decision on the same case. As regards these smaller jurisdictions, we are pretty much in the same state as the French were, three centuries ago; when there was one *Coutumier* of Normandy, and another of Lorraine, the one essentially different from the other. There is no barrister with even a small share of practice who must not be aware that great delays and considerable expense attend the trial of the most trivial and frivolous suits. As an instance out of many, Mr. William Glover, who has

recently published a small pamphlet on Lord Brougham's Law Reform, gives the following :

"I was professionally concerned, says he, in an action lately tried before Mr. Justice Parke, at the London sittings, Guildhall, when a lamp, valued by the plaintiff at 2l. 10s. and by the defendant at 1l. 18s. became the subject of litigation. The parties—Jones v. Harris—were respectable tradesmen, carrying on business in Finsbury place and Holborn. An attorney had previously requested a settlement of the demand, when the defendant offered to pay the last-mentioned sum. The writ was served on the 5th of November, 1830. The declaration and pleadings were subsequently filed, issue joined, and notice of trial given for the adjourned Michaelmas sittings. In Hilary term, defendant's attorney moved for judgment as in case of a non-suit for not proceeding to trial pursuant to notice. The rule was discharged on a peremptory undertaking to bring on the issue for trial at the sitting after the next term. It was accordingly set down and continued in the paper some months before any hearing of the cause was expected. After Michaelmas term, 1831, my client attended with his counsel and witnesses for several days, but the case was not then called. However, at the adjourned Hilary sittings in February, 1832, after I had received another fee, technically denominated a *refresher*, the trial occurred. Counsel were heard and several witnesses examined on either side, when the jury, after a patient investigation, returned such a verdict as we desired. Though they found nominally for the plaintiff 1l. 18s. yet it was virtually a verdict for my client, because given for the sum which he was originally willing to pay, being under 40s. Both parties residing in the county of Middlesex, the plaintiff thus rendered himself liable to pay the defendant double costs, for having brought an action in the King's Bench, when his proper remedy for recovering the debt, was by summons in the County Court.

"At the subsequent Easter term, upon motion in the King's Bench, a rule *nisi* was granted, and afterwards made absolute, to show cause why the defendant should not be at liberty to enter on the roll a suggestion under the Middlesex County Court Act. Defendant's attorney attended to make the suggestion, when it was found the *postea* had not been entered. Application was again made to the Court, which determined that plaintiff's attorney should forthwith enter the *postea*, or enable defendant's attorney so to do, by delivering up the *nisi prius* record. This not being effectual, an attachment was moved for, when plaintiff's attorney having sworn that the record was stolen and sold, the rule was discharged on payment of costs, and an order made that defendant's attorney should make up and enter the *postea* on the roll. In Trinity term it was entered—in Michaelmas term rule for judgment was given. After this last proceeding on 9th November, 1832, the matter was arranged by plaintiff's attorney compromising with defendant's attorney, who consented to take the sum of 65l. as payment for his bill, being somewhat less than even his single costs. Besides which, the plaintiff had defrayed expenses on his own part to the amount of 45l., making a loss of 110l. by the payment of costs alone, though he succeeded in obtaining a verdict."

It has been often said that one fact is worth a thousand arguments, and here is a fact which speaks trumpet-tongued. Here are upwards of two years spent to the period of compromise in an action respecting a difference of twelve shillings ! Here the successful litigant obtains a verdict of 38s. at an expense in costs of 110l. And yet this case was as full of intricacies, and occupied as much of the time and skill of the Judge, as though the amount in dispute had been 100,000l. Is it not preposterous to occupy the time of the Superior Courts with such trumpery affairs as this ?

In the earlier and brighter periods of British history, Justice was brought home to the door of every man in England. When Alfred succeeded to the monarchy, he constituted many Courts of Judicature

wherein injuries were redressed in an easy and expeditious manner. The Court Baron was held by the Steward of the Manor, and freeholders were bound by their feudal tenure to assist in the dispensation of domestic justice; the Hundred Court was held monthly or oftener; the County Court being incident to the jurisdiction of the Sheriff, he was only the ministerial officer; while in this, as well as in the Hundred Court freeholders of the county were the actual judges. At length these Local Judicatures became inefficient. By advice of Parliament they were superseded, and the kingdom divided into Six Circuits. But it was soon perceived that this latter system, though it had some advantages, had greatly counterbalancing defects. Sir Matthew Hale—and there is no greater name in British Law—observes, that by the true and wise Constitution of this kingdom, suits where the debt or damage amounted not to 40s. were not to be determined in the Courts of Westminster, unless a title of land came in question. And he proposes as a measure of reform that in all questions where the sum litigated amounts only to 10*l.*, it should be contended for in District Courts. Sir Matthew remarks that 10*l.* in his day was not so much in intrinsic value as 40s. in the time of Edward the First; and we may as truly remark that 20*l.* now is not so much intrinsically as 10*l.* was in the days of Sir Matthew Hale. The words of this great authority in favour of District Courts are so strong, and at the present juncture so applicable, that we cannot express our own meaning more clearly than by adopting the language of the Chief Justice. He says:

“In my understanding (speaking of District Courts with cognizance of suits of 10*l.*) if things were reduced to this state it would be a great ease to the people—it would disburden Westminster Hall of many suits which are indeed a reproach to the honour and dignity of it—it would prevent multitudes of oppressive suits, many men suing for trifles, because, if they recover the costs, they will crush and undo the defendant, being often forty times more than the principal.”

Lord Redesdale was the first man in modern times who followed out the notion of Sir Matthew Hale. In 1820, he introduced a bill for the more convenient recovery of small debts in England and Wales. He proposed that the jurors should be of a limited number, the process of recovery plain and simple—the expense as little as possible. In order to render the burthen of attendance very light on the industrious portion of the community, he contended that four jurors should form a quorum. Lord Redesdale's bill failed, and in a very few years after he died, “*re infectâ*.”

Four years after the failure of Lord Redesdale's proposed bill, Lord Althorp took up the subject. His lordship brought in a bill to prevent delays and expenses in county courts, and for the more easy and speedy recovery of small debts in England and Wales. He proposed that in every county in England an Assessor should be appointed to the Sheriff, who should make a circuit through the different towns of the county, and that the cases should be decided by the intervention of a jury. The Assessor was to be a barrister of some years standing, with a salary out of the county rate.

In 1828, when Secretary of State for the Home Department, Sir Robert Peel obtained leave to bring in a bill for the more speedy recovery of small debts. He proposed to adopt the ancient system of County Courts, and to extend its jurisdiction from debts of 40s. to debts of 10*l.*. It was further proposed that the remedy should not be

against the person of the debtor, but against his goods. In the case of a debt of 15*l.*, the creditor might take advantage of the provisions of the bill, but afterwards it might be extended to 20*l.* He wished to preserve to the Court the power of allowing the debtor to discharge his incumbrances by instalments, which would prevent an unfortunate man having his goods taken away from him, while at the same time it would be a security to the creditor for the payment of his debt. He limited these instalments to the space of four months, that the ulterior process of seizing the debtor's goods might be resorted to by the creditor in default of payment. In the course of the session, the Ex-Secretary for the Home Department declared that it was with regret that he saw that all the pains he had bestowed on the bill would be unavailing, but he felt he should be acting for the interests of the public to abandon the measure.

In 1830, Mr., now Lord Brougham, took up the subject. His object was to make no change in the fundamental part of the law of England; to make no change in the practice which was not in harmony with principle; and to render the Local Judicatures amenable to the greater jurisdiction of the Superior Courts. The bill passed the Commons, and was immediately submitted to the Lords; but its due consideration was impeded by a dissolution. It was renewed in the next session, and referred to the Common Law Commissioners. They recommended some improvements, but Lord Lyndhurst opposed the bill with great vigour, effect, and subtilty, and again it fell to the ground. The mass of the people of England have, however, set their hearts on the passing of some measure, uniting the character of the four bills we have alluded to, and we are glad to perceive that Lord Althorp has stated that it is the intention of Government to bring such a measure forward.

It is, however, with proportionate regret we perceive that Mr. Rigby Wason, himself a barrister, and now member for Ipswich, has taken the field against the measure, on the ground, that the Local Courts Bill would destroy the independence of the Bar, enlarge the power of the Crown, increase the disposition to litigation, and create local prejudice and prepossession in the breast of the Judge. Some of these effects were no doubt incident to the system of small District Jurisdictions in France, previously to the Revolution, but there is no analogy existing between the state of France and of England; still less are there grounds for the institution of comparisons between the French and English bar. The social position of an Avocat in France is widely different from that of a Barrister in England. Had we time or space we might point out these differences to our readers, but at present we have neither the one nor the other, and perhaps after all, the occasion is not the most fitting. The English bar, although greatly fallen from its high estate, presents few, if any, Melinde Douais; and it cannot be contended that the evils which followed in the wake of the small jurisdictions in France would also necessarily accompany their introduction into England. Fortunately for those friendly to the institution of Local Courts, Ireland furnishes a case in point. A system of small jurisdictions was introduced into Ireland in the year 1716, in the reign of Geo. I., when a portion of the jurisdiction was taken away from the Superior Courts in Dublin and transferred

to the summary jurisdiction of Judges of Assize, who were empowered to decide causes to a certain amount *in a summary form, and not according to the system of pleading established in the Superior Courts.* This jurisdiction, was in 1796 transferred to the assistant barristers, who still retain it; and during a period of nearly forty years we have never heard any imputation on their judicial fairness. Not only has Justice been well administered, but the character of the bar has not in the slightest degree been degraded by the quantity of business thus taken from the Superior Courts,\* or have we ever heard of any prepossession or prejudice existing in the minds of these judges.

There can be no doubt that the institution of a number of District Judges would give considerable patronage to the Crown, or rather to the Ministers of the day, but we think this objection may be removed by vesting the appointments in the Chancellor, the two Chief Justices, and the Chief Baron. Power and patronage must reside somewhere, and perhaps in the present instance we have but an election of evils. But one of these evils is of much greater magnitude than the other. It would be better, far better, that even a bad Ministry should thus acquire the patronage of some fifty or sixty places of 700*l.* or 800*l.* a year each, than that the great mass of the people should be subject to the delays, uncertainties, and expenses of suits in Westminster Hall.

Upon the whole, therefore, we are of opinion that the institution of Local Courts would be a great national good. The question is not one of party. It has been taken up alternately by Lord Redesdale, a Tory, and Lord Althorp, a Whig, by Sir Robert Peel, and Mr. Brugham, both differing in politics, "wide as the pole asunder," and it has been recommended by the Common Law Commissioners at the conclusion of a Report, which sums up the question so clearly and concisely than we cannot do better than to append it to this article.

"The present inferior courts, say the commissioners, are more or less open to objection, which arise from their jurisdiction being in general too limited in point of amount and local extent, from suits being removable into the higher courts without security, the want of competent judges and juries, the want of sufficient and simple process to compel an appearance, the use of complicated and expensive pleadings, the distance of the place of trial from the residence of the parties and witnesses, the want of sufficient means to compel the attendance of witnesses, delay, the facility of evading execution, the abuses occasioned by entrusting the execution of process to improper agents, for whose misconduct no superior is responsible, the want of appeal, and expense of proceedings, as compared with the amount of the demand."

It appears, therefore, expedient and necessary, that the whole kingdom should be divided into districts for the purpose of establishing Local Courts upon a uniform system, and that such provision should be made as shall most effectually exclude the evil of expense in the conveyance and maintenance of witnesses, and the inconvenience now felt in detaining parties, witnesses, and jurors at a distant place of trial.

---

\* For further information on this subject, see Lord Plunkett's able speech on the Local Courts Bill.

## THE TWO NIGHTS ADJOURNED DISCUSSION ON THE CORN LAWS.

—On Thursday and Friday, the 6th and 7th instant, the House of Commons was occupied entirely with the discussion on Mr. Hume's motion for a Committee of the whole House, to consider the propriety of revising the present Corn Laws, by substituting a fixed duty on the importation of foreign corn, and a fixed bounty on the exportation of British Corn, in lieu of the present system of averages and fluctuating duties. The House was fully attended, during every part of the debate, there being never less than 300, and at one period of the second evening, nearly 500 present, though the numbers at the division were only 471, many having paired off, unable to sustain the prolonged sitting. This fact sufficiently shows the deep interest felt in the subject; as nothing but that interest could sustain men in their continued attendance, in a cramped position of body, in a heated and most exhausting atmosphere, and with minds generally so entirely made up on the subject, that there was little new to be learnt from any of the speeches on either side; not one person probably in the whole House, having his previously entertained opinions changed by any facts or arguments addressed to him. In truth, the Landed Proprietors considered their personal and pecuniary interests attacked, and made a determined stand to preserve them. The mercantile and manufacturing Members considered their interests at stake, and therefore made a strong muster to protect them: while a few, having no interests involved in the issue of the question, arrayed themselves, from principle and conviction, on the side of the people. The passions and the feelings, therefore, of the two great contending parties were quite as much enlisted in the combat as their reason: though the debate was conducted with less of acrimony on either side than many of a purely political nature.

There were some remarkable and honourable exceptions among the landed proprietors, who advocated a repeal of the present Corn Laws, and who deserve especial mention. Mr. Littleton, Lord Duncannon, Mr. Whitmore, Mr. E. Buller, Lord Morpeth, Sir George Strickland, Lord Howick, and Lord Molyneux. Mr. Hume himself is indeed a larger holder of landed than of any other description of property, having some few years since purchased extensive estates in the county of Norfolk; and Lord Fitzwilliam and Lord Durham in the Upper House, both having their whole possessions in land, are well known to be opposed to the present Corn Laws; while the Members of Government, Mr. Ellice, Mr. Charles Wood, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Vernon Smith, and Mr. Poulett Thomson, joined their votes to those of Mr. Littleton, Lord Howick, and Lord Duncannon in support of Mr. Hume. Notwithstanding these deductions, however, it cannot be denied, that in the Upper House of Parliament, where all the Members are extensive

landowners, there is not the remotest chance of obtaining their willing assent to an abolition of the Corn Laws; while in the Lower House, so great is still the predominance of the landed gentry, as representatives, over every other class, that there is no reasonable hope of carrying the abolition, there until the House has undergone two or three successive purifications at least. In the mean time, all the evils already inflicted by those laws, will go on increasing every month, till the agricultural interest shall be still further depressed, till increased poor-rates to sustain manufacturers thrown out of employ shall make the manufacturing as destitute as the agricultural population; and then, both classes uniting, their frenzy of despair will array them in deadly hostility against their enemies, and one general revolution sweep away all the existing obstacles to the accomplishment of their wishes. When the whole community are brought to the verge of desperation, it will then be in vain to propose a commutation of tithe, nothing will be accepted but their abolition;—when the revenue shall cease to equal the full amount required for the interest of the national debt, it will be in vain to propose adjustment, nothing will then do but its extinction;—when the sources from which the poor-rates are now paid shall be dried up, it will be in vain to talk of revision, what will then follow will be their annihilation. Whether this will come to pass in three years or in five, in six years or in seven, it would be useless to predict; but that come it will, if no attempts be made to stay its progress, more than are now making by those who are at the helm of affairs, it requires not the gift of prophecy to foretell; though we believe the insensibility of the Ministry, and of the landed aristocracy generally, to be such, that they are perfectly blind to their own position, and wholly unconscious of the rapidity with which they are hastening to the precipice of their own destruction.

To give all the speeches delivered in the two nights debate, would require four times the space contained in the whole of one of our Numbers. The speeches were most unreasonably and wearisomely long, and surpassed all bounds of moderation. Mr. Hume spoke for nearly three hours in opening his subject; Sir James Graham was quite as long on his legs; and Mr. Poulett Thomson was to the full as long as either; so that here were nine hours consumed by three speakers only, and as all the time occupied by the debate on the two nights did not exceed twelve hours, there were only three hours left to be divided among all the other speakers. The consequence was, that a great many members who had prepared themselves to speak in support of the abolition of the Corn Laws, who rose several times to do so, and who represented places having a strong claim to be heard on so vital a subject, were unable to obtain a hearing. We may mention among others, Mr. Grote, for London; Mr. Baines, for Leeds; Mr. Attwood, for Birmingham; Lord Molyneux, for Lancashire; Mr. Gisborne, for Derbyshire; Mr. Harvey, for Colchester; each of those gentlemen had, as well as ourselves, watched every opportunity of rising, and no doubt many others were also anxious to be heard, but all were prevented by the excessive length to which the three speakers named extended their observations. To show that a much more just and equitable distribution of time is practicable, we may refer to the recent instance of the debate on Impressment, which commenced about eight o'clock, and lasted till nearly twelve; occupying less than four hours,



during which no less than fourteen speakers successively addressed the House, making therefore an average on the whole of about twenty minutes, or less than half an hour, for each speech: and when it is considered that the question of the Corn Laws is one which has engaged the public mind for years, on which it is almost impossible to say any thing new, and the principles of which lie in a very narrow compass, and can be stated in an extremely concise shape, we must say that the occupation of nine hours by three speakers is a very striking contrast indeed to the occupation of four hours by fourteen gentlemen, not one of whom was interrupted in the course of his address, but spoke quite as long as he himself wished.

The effect of this excessive length of the speeches in question was, we are sure, to overlay the subject with multiplicity of details, which could not be accurately remembered throughout, and which therefore tended only to crowd the memory, confuse the understanding, and cloud the judgment. The speeches of Colonel Torrens and Lord Morpeth were exceptions to this, and placing, as we think they do, the strongest points in the clearest light, we give them entire, but for the reasons before stated, we must content ourselves with stating the general character merely of the others.

Previously to the opening of the debate by Mr. Hume, he presented from the City of London, a petition, signed by upwards of 31,000 individuals, including merchants, bankers, shipowners, traders, &c.; but if it had been signed by as many millions, it would have created no impression on such a tribunal. Petitions, to produce any effect, must come in great numbers, be presented by different members, and the battery be discharged daily, for a whole session, as they were on the Slavery question. Petitioners can only make themselves attended to by becoming troublesome, by rousing the fears of the House, by creating alarm, and by being never-ending; and to this, on the subject of the Corn Laws, the petitions have not yet arrived. When there are meetings in every town, and resolutions in every newspaper, when there are petitions in the hand of every member, and speeches made upon them every day, then they will produce effect in Parliament. But any thing short of that, is strength wasted, and time thrown away.

Mr. Hume's speech was full of those details of facts, figures, quantities, and prices, of which no man has a greater store for constant use, than himself: and we must do him the justice to say, that these were so well arranged and so well connected, that in a tribunal of disinterested judges, they would not fail to carry conviction to the mind. To abridge statements of this description is, as must be readily perceived, impossible; and to give them at the length to which they were delivered is, for the reasons assigned, equally so. We content ourselves, therefore, by saying, that the speech contained not merely enough, but much more than was necessary, to establish the grounds of his motion, and completely to prove his case.

Colonel TORRENS seconded the motion; and in doing so explained to the house the reasons which induced him to believe that it was necessary to the peace and prosperity of the country that Parliament should gradually abolish every restriction on the importation of human food. On a question so vitally important to the best interests of the country we should argue with the utmost candour, and should state the truth broadly and plainly on both sides. The advocates of the agricultural interest had one argument, and only one sound argument, for the

support of their views on this subject. It was this—that, in a country like England, so densely inhabited by a manufacturing population, it was dangerous to trust to foreign countries for a regular supply of corn and food. That was not a valid argument, and those who used it knew that as well as he did. Besides, they did not argue consistently even upon their own principles; for if they wished the population of England to be independent of the importation of foreign corn, why did they object to the introduction of foreign barley? Why did they object to the use of sugar and molasses instead of malt? If the introduction of foreign barley duty free were permitted, the ground which was now employed in the growth of barley might be employed in the growth of corn, generally used as food for man. They told the country that they wished it to be independent of foreign supply, and yet with the same breath they prohibited the introduction of that article which would enable it to grow a greater quantity of human food. (Hear.) The agriculturists were also accustomed to say that the home market was the best market for the manufacturer. Now that argument he would turn against the agriculturists themselves, for if the home market was the best market for the manufacturer, it was also the best market for the agriculturist. The manufacturer of muslin, having an article of great value in small bulk, could go to a foreign market and sell his commodity with profit; but the grower of corn and grass, having an article of small value in large bulk, could not take his corn and grass to a foreign market, but was left dependent on the home market. There never yet was a rich agricultural country which had not large manufacturing towns for the sale of its produce. Now, if the abolition of the restrictions on food should tend to increase the numbers of the manufacturing population, it was clear that there would rise up along with those numbers an increased market for agricultural produce; whereas, if the continuance of our restrictions upon the importation of foreign corn should, by lowering the rate of wages, and depressing the profits of capital, drive our manufacturing population into countries governed by wiser regulations than our own, the agriculturists would lose that market which they now possessed, and which they would look in vain elsewhere. (Hear, hear.) He asked the house to consider what the effect would be on the value and rent of land, supposing the manufacturing population of England were doubled. What, he would ask, would be the amount of increased rent given for houses and for building-ground? What would be the amount of increased rent given for garden-ground and pleasure-ground? What would be the amount of increased value given for every species of agricultural produce—for corn, for grass, for meat, for cheese, &c.? (Hear, hear.) He had no hesitation in saying, that if the manufacturing population consuming agricultural produce were doubled, the rent and value of the land would be more than doubled. The agriculturists would in that manner gain an increased demand for their produce, which they were now vainly seeking to obtain by restriction and monopoly. (Hear.) He would now entreat the house to consider what the effect on the value and rent of land would be, if some disastrous cause were suddenly to diminish the numbers of our manufacturing population.

It was now generally believed that the country required 1-10th part of its food to be imported from abroad. Suppose that 1-5th of the manufacturing population were suddenly to decay and perish, the agriculturist would then supply the home market with a greater quantity of food than the remaining population could consume, England would then become an exporting country, and in that case what would be the value of the mortgages on the estates of the country gentlemen? Nay, what would be the value of the estates themselves, with all the houses and cottages built upon them? (Hear, hear.) England would then become what Poland now is; instead of having the price of corn here higher by the amount of freight and insurance than it is on the continent, you would have it lower, exactly by the same amount. In such a state of things the landed proprietors would be the greatest sufferers. Agriculture and corn would remain here in silent and melancholy repose. The manufacturer would carry his capital and skill to countries more wisely governed, whilst the landlord, like the giant Despair in the allegory, would live to lament the prosperity which he had destroyed, and the desolation which he had himself created. (Hear, hear.)

Hitherto he had argued the question on behalf of the landlords. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) He had shown that the prosperity of the landed interest was based on the prosperity of the commercial and manufacturing interests, and that if the landowners were foolish enough to push their monopoly too far, they must inevitably destroy themselves. (Hear, hear.) He would ask them to consider whether, in the present times, and with the intelligence which now pervaded the manufacturing districts, the manufacturing population were likely to endure that monopoly longer in quiet? (Hear, hear.) No proposition in political economy was more clearly demonstrated than this—that as you increase the price of agricultural produce, you depress the wages of manufacturing industry, and lower also the profits of capital. Now, was it likely that the great towns would allow the landholders to depress the wages of their population for the selfish purpose of augmenting their own rents? (Loud cries of "Hear.") He would tell the landholders that the intelligent and important towns, which owed their greatness to the success of their manufactories, would not allow them so to act. He therefore advised them to be wise in their generation, and to come voluntarily, whilst yet they might, to a wise and wholesome resolution on this subject. (Cheers.) How could they hope to stand against the just claims and indignation of the country upon the ground which they had taken? He challenged them, with all their acuteness and ingenuity, to show the contrary of this proposition—that as you increase the price of agricultural produce, you depress wages and lower profits. Whilst this proposition remained unrefuted—and he again challenged them to disprove it—how could they attempt to bolster up their wretched system? Did they suppose that the intelligent people of England would submit to be put down without hearing some reason why they should be put down? (Hear, hear.) He warned the landholders not to mistake the position in which they were now placed. In supporting their wretched monopoly, they were vainly contending against an irresistible power—the omnipotence of truth. (Hear.)

He hoped that his intelligent fellow-countrymen, the members for Ireland, would support the total abolition of the Corn Laws. (Cries of "No, no.") If they acted consistently they certainly would. (The same cries repeated.) If they were true to their own principles they would. ("No, no.") He said "Yes, yes." (a laugh), and would briefly tell them why. The patriotic and liberal members complained, and complained justly, that absenteeism was the great evil of that country; and that one cause of Irish poverty was the amount of rents raised in the country and spent out of it. Now, if they would let Polish corn enter free of duty into England, less corn would be drawn from Ireland, and therefore more would be left to feed its starving population. But there were some gentlemen from Ireland who were advocates for the Repeal of the Union. Those gentlemen were in the habit of saying that there was not at present any protection for the manufactured goods of Ireland. Well, then, let them have a little protection for their manufactures. England would of course retaliate, and would, perhaps, place a duty on the importation of Irish grain. Now, on their principles the abolition of the Corn Laws would just answer their purpose, for less grain would then be exported from Ireland, more grain would remain within it, food would become cheaper, and thus cheap food would be at once a support and protection to the Irish manufacturer. As labour was cheap in Ireland, and as there were no poor laws to throw heavy rates upon the cultivators of the soil, there could be no cause for distress in Ireland save high rents. Now, nothing would reduce the rents in Ireland so much as allowing us in England to have cheap corn from foreign countries; but, putting these considerations aside, and returning gravely to the question (hear, hear), he would ask the landlords whether they thought it possible to maintain much longer the existing Corn Laws, and to uphold a system of which the effect is to limit and contract the foreign market for our manufactured goods, and, as he had before stated, to lower the wages of labour and to depress the profits of capital? The thing was absolutely impossible, and he defied the hon. and learned member for Kirkcubright to come to a different conclusion. (Hear.)

The hon. and gallant officer then proceeded to say, that never country was so blessed as England with all the elements of prosperity. We had extensive fields

of coal, more estimable than mines of silver and gold, which gave us an advantage in the foreign market over the foreign manufacturer. All that we wanted was cheap corn. (Hear, hear.) We had already cheap fuel. The foreigner had cheap corn, and the consequence was that in Saxony some goods were manufactured cheaper than they were in Manchester. Thus the high price of food robbed England of the advantages which she ought to derive from her cheap fuel. (Hear, hear.) Some gentlemen said, that even if the corn laws were abrogated, the price of corn would not fall much in England. He cared not how that might turn out. If the price of corn did not fall here, it must rise upon the continent. In that case, the comparative advantages which the foreign manufacturer now possessed over the British manufacturer would be done away with, and the British manufacturer would have the full benefit of cheaper fuel. There would, in his opinion, be no limit to the prosperity of England if the Legislature would open the ports to the free introduction of foreign corn. Every quarter of corn which we received from foreign parts would be in payment for some portion of our manufactures; and when he considered the immense agricultural resources which belonged to Russia on one side of us, and to America on the other, he said that the imagination of man could not set a limit to the prosperity of England receiving foreign corn free from duty, and raw materials untaxed. (Hear, hear.) He thought that our manufacturing population would increase with a rapidity as great as the constitution of human nature would permit; he thought that it would double itself every twenty-five years if it had a plenteous supply of food. Why at this moment was America so happy? Because as the population increased it spread over the plains of that mighty continent which were still unreclaimed, and there found abundance of food. Why was England less fortunate? Because she was hampered by restrictions and monopolies, which prevented the labourer from obtaining a supply of cheap food. (Hear, hear.) The house had only to abolish the high duty now laid on the importation of foreign corn to give to the country high wages and high profits. (Hear, hear.)

The landlords of England were that evening upon their trial; they must now come before their country, they must show that the demonstration of principles laid down by those who had looked at this question with a philosophic and statesman-like eye contained an inherent fallacy, and was worth nothing; they must show that human labour can obtain high wages, when it is employed in cultivating a soil which only returns a bare subsistence to its cultivator; they must prove an impossibility, and show that it is not the interest of man to get as much food as cheap as he can. Declamation on this subject would not do; it would be worse than useless, and the hon. member for Essex must show, if he could, by plain argument, that a high price of agricultural produce would produce a high rate of wages, and increase the profits of capital. (Hear, hear.) If the hon. member should succeed in proving that a high price of corn would not lower wages, he would divide along with him (Mr. Baring), although he now came forward to second the motion of his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex. (Cheers and laughter.)

Sir James Graham followed Colonel Torrens; but though he spoke at as great a length as Mr. Hume, and introduced quite as many details of figures, quantities, prices, &c., we think it is easy to state the sum and substance of his arguments in a short compass. He began by saying, that this was not, as had been said, a landlord's question, but a question affecting the interests of the whole community. But (and this is one of the inconveniences of speeches of great length), before he got to the end he forgot this assertion entirely, and admitted that it was a landlord's question; saying, that the landed property of England was already so surrounded with difficulties that, if the Corn Laws were abolished, before five years were over three-fourths of the landed property of England would be in the market for sale, to pay off its incumbrances, and the landed aristocracy would be utterly ruined. He contended, that notwithstanding all the protection they had en-

joyed, the agricultural interests were the most depressed in the kingdom; while the manufactures, to which such protection had not been extended, were all flourishing; and yet he asked for the continuance of this very system, under which agriculture had declined to so low an ebb. He contended that the present system was favourable to all classes, by preserving steadiness of price instead of great fluctuation, keeping inferior lands in cultivation and thereby employing many agricultural labourers, and rendering us independent of foreign supply in the event of a war. This was the sum and substance of his speech, of which we give the closing part, in which he appealed to those by whom he was surrounded, in terms that he well knew would find a responsive echo in every landed gentleman's breast.

He was now prepared to do what he then called upon the house to do—he was prepared to stand by the existing Corn Laws, and to resist any the first inroad which might be attempted to be made upon them. As an honest man he felt it his duty to resist, and to resist to the utmost of his power, any measure which went to create a sudden simultaneous reduction of rent. (Hear, hear.) It was admitted by the hon. member for Middlesex that the effect of such a measure as that which he proposed would be a reduction of 20 per cent. in the rent of land. Now, would the house take a step calculated to produce such an effect as that? If the effect of the proposed measure should be to reduce rents 20 per cent., he spoke advisedly when he said that two-thirds of the landed property of England would at once change hands. (Hear, hear.) Now, he conceived that a measure pregnant with such effects was nothing short of injustice, and to any such measure he would not give his support. (Hear, hear.) He did not think that it could possibly be any benefit to the state that a great change of proprietors should thus suddenly and simultaneously take place; it would be attended with great individual suffering—with much individual injustice. How far soever those evils might eventually attend such a large and extensive change, brought about under any circumstances, yet if it took place gradually—if large capitals should be brought to bear quietly and peaceably on the purchase of land—if an immense mass of land should not be thrown together into the market, those necessary evils would be greatly mitigated, and the suffering occasioned by such a gradual transmutation would be comparatively slight. But if the house were in one night to change the existing system of the Corn Laws, the injustice thereby produced would be immense, and the danger beyond calculation. However unjust such a change in the property of the country might be under any circumstances, if gradual and not sudden, it might be safe. But in the present instance the change would be at once dangerous and overwhelming. He would repeat that such a sudden change would be equivalent to an agrarian law—it would be a complete change in the existing frame of society. (Hear, hear.) These were the considerations which weighed with him principally in opposing this motion—considerations which could never be dissociated from such a measure as that now proposed. It was a measure, he would be bold to say, that would not be beneficial to the community at large, for no measure could possibly be productive of general benefit which was calculated, like the present, to bring about a great change of property—to effect great individual misery, and to produce the total destruction of an entire class of the community. (Hear, hear.) It would be no small evil when such a change would produce the destruction of an entire class of the community; and when such a class was the agricultural interest—the most important class of all—his solemn opinion was that its destruction would be the destruction of the state itself. The right hon. baronet sat down amidst very loud and general cheering.

Mr. F. O'Connor, the member for the greatest agricultural county in Ireland, namely, Cork; Mr. Richards, the member for one of the most agricultural of the English boroughs, Knaresborough; and Mr. Heathcote, the member for one of the greatest and most exclusively

agricultural counties of England, namely, Lincolnshire, opposed any alteration whatever in the Corn Laws.

LORD MORPETH said, that however great he might have felt the difficulty of following his right hon. friend near him (Sir J. Graham) upon this subject, that difficulty was much increased when he came forward to state as briefly as he could the grounds upon which he should give his entire support to the motion of the hon. member for Middlesex. (Hear.) Ever since he (Lord Morpeth) had taken any share in politics, when sitting in Parliament as the representative of an agricultural borough, and when liberal opinions upon the subject of the Corn Laws were less popular than at present (because less understood), he had formed one of a minority of 16 with the hon. member for Middlesex upon this subject, a subject upon which he had never held an opinion more firmly than that which, though it had been styled vulgar by his right hon. friend (not seriously, he hoped), he still maintained—namely, that it was incumbent upon the Legislature (come what might) to make as cheap as possible the food of the country. (Hear, hear.) He (Lord Morpeth) belonged himself exclusively to the landed interest, residing generally amongst an agricultural population, for whose interests he was sincerely anxious, and who were at the present period labouring under great distress. He now represented a great agricultural as well as commercial county: he was not, however, sent to Parliament merely as the representative of those interests, but to legislate for the advantage and benefit of the whole community, and in that capacity he felt bound to put aside both his personal and representative impressions, and having done so he felt unable to refuse his assent to the demonstrations of public opinion which had been put forth for a more open, free, and fixed trade in corn. (Hear.) He must contend that the same principle which was applied to every other article ought to be extended to that commodity, and that wherever an article could be bought the cheapest, and consequently with the least waste of the means of purchase, that market ought to be preserved. No better means of cheating a nation could be devised than the existing restrictive laws; for cheated the nation would be, so long as it was compelled to resort to one shop for a commodity which it could purchase at another at a much cheaper rate. (Hear.)

At a time when the Legislature was about to take steps which he trusted would sensibly and materially diminish the burdens exclusively pressing upon the agriculturalists of this country, he trusted that no reasonable opponent to the Corn laws would object to take them fully into account, in order to ascertain the real amount and bearing of their results, and to make every adequate allowance accordingly. He could not, of course, be insensible to the argument, that at the present period, when the distress of the agriculturalist had been promulgated from the throne and acknowledged by Parliament, it might seem harsh to have recourse to measures which we suspected to be of a tendency calculated to aggravate and prolong that distress. Neither could he forget the suggestion that a paramount injury would result to the British agriculturalist by a relaxation of the restrictions upon the importation of foreign corn. He would, however, respond, that the worst injury which could befall the agriculturalist would be from change, alteration, and fluctuation; and as he well knew the present system of corn laws would not be suffered by the people to continue unassailed and undisturbed, and that the nation had not now patience to abide under such a system, so he felt satisfied that, even looking at the agricultural interest alone, no prospect of security could be realized until the matter was placed on such a basis as the great body of the people would consider just to all classes of the community. Surely, then, the present period, when wheat was 48s. per quarter, was the moment, of all others, when this bargain or arrangement could be most properly made; this, in short, was the time of all others for the landholder to strike his bargain. The right hon. baronet had alluded to the state of the manufactures, and had stated that they were fully employed, whilst the agricultural population was not so engaged; but was the right hon. baronet aware that when the manufacturing classes were successfully employed, a great portion of the agricultural population were also absorbed in the same pursuits, and therefore that if an extension of manufacturing employment was afforded it would more and more absorb the masses of that population which confessedly could not

now find employment in agriculture under the chilling wing of protection? (Hear, hear.)

It was no part of his (Lord Morpeth's) intention to enter on the present occasion into minute calculations as to the manner in which the question ought to be regulated; and he should rather leave that for future discussion and deliberation. He was, however, most undoubtedly inclined, from all that he had been enabled to gather, to support the operation of free trade generally, but it did certainly appear to him that the principle, though extending to all other articles, was stopped short in respect to the article of bread. If this nation was to compete with the foreigner, the Legislature was bound to give to domestic labour and industry every advantage within its reach, and not to bear it down by burdens which were unnecessary for the engagements of the nation. (Hear, hear.) He knew that the decorous and proper language to use upon an occasion similar to that in which the house was then engaged, would be to say that the subject was one in which the interests of all classes were joined and identical; but he must remind the house, that as there were links which upheld all classes distinct, the Legislature should not inquire what was most beneficial to particular classes of the community, but deal with the subject matter brought under its consideration in the manner best calculated to promote the interests, happiness, and prosperity of the whole nation. He would only further remark, that though he was unable to meet the arguments of some of the friends of free trade, as to the comparative statement of the interests of the manufacturing and agricultural classes, yet he thought that the truth or fallacy of such arguments did not at all concern the point at present at issue. The argument in favour of restriction, which had been urged, would be well founded if this country was purely an agricultural nation, or was prepared to become so; it might be well to insist upon such an argument if, like the vale of Tempe, this nation was unburdened by a debt. Such, however, was not the case, and as this country had chosen to support the character of a high and great nation, and to wage long and expensive wars, it was necessary, in order to carry into effect those objects of the national policy, to call in aid the commercial as well as the agricultural resources of the land. It would be just as reasonable for the inhabitants of the banks of the Scheldt, or the proprietors of the villas on the Brenta, to declare themselves agriculturists, and restrict the markets of Venice and Amsterdam, as for this country to seek an agricultural character solely. It was in vain for the population of Great Britain to assume an Arcadian character, saddled as they were with a debt of 800,000,000*l.* He should not further trouble the house than to express his determination to give his most cordial support to the motion of the hon. member for Middlesex. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Clay, the member for the Tower Hamlets, made a very sensible speech in support of Mr. Hume's motion, but the House growing impatient after the long speeches of the previous speakers, he was much interrupted, and very imperfectly heard; and Mr. E. Buller, the member for Staffordshire, who also spoke in support of the motion, was so clamoured against, that those seated within a few yards of distance, and in the best position for hearing, right opposite to him, could scarcely catch one perfect sentence. He spoke, nevertheless, for half an hour, but it was like talking against the tempest. The loud conversation going on on all sides, and the continued attempts to clamour the speaker down, by cries of "Question," and, "Divide," rendered him at length quite inaudible; and at midnight, Mr. Ewart, of Liverpool, moved the adjournment of the debate.

On the following evening, Friday, Mr. Ewart having the precedence, by moving the adjournment of the debate, spoke in support of the motion of Mr. Hume, and directed his arguments chiefly to shew the injurious effects of the existing Corn Laws on our trade and manufactures.

Lord Darlington followed in support of the Corn Laws, and maintained the line of argument pursued by Sir James Graham. He concluded by saying that he had received a communication from the highest quarter in the Government, urging him not to divide the landed interest in the House of Commons by the proposition of any amendment in which they could not all agree, but to endeavour to unite them so as to negative the motion of Mr. Hume by the largest majority possible.

Mr. Poulett Thomson then rose—and being a member of the Government, though not of the Cabinet, he occupied more than half an hour in a prefatory and apologetical introduction, before he even began to enter on the question. His speech was quite as long as Sir James Graham's, and equally statistical in its details; these details, however, proving the very reverse of the positions attempted to be established by Sir James. That Mr. Thomson was master of the subject on which he spoke, no one could deny; but it is equally undeniable, that from the monotonous and heavy delivery, the lugubriousness and solemnity of tone, and the singularly jerking method of endeavouring by the ducking of the head and the swinging of the arm to enforce an emphasis on every third or fourth word, he is a very tiresome speaker, and more tedious to listen to for any length of time than would be thought possible, considering the great extent of his information, and the extreme liberality of his views on all commercial questions. But the simplicity of nature is in him exchanged for a highly-sustained and even pompous oratorical tone; and instead of that variety, which logical acuteness in argument and earnestness of feeling in appeal, so agreeably afford to each other, when skilfully and naturally blended, his whole march is heavy, slow, and funereal, and seems a mournful oration over some departed friend.

Mr. Alexander Baring followed Mr. Thomson, and began by assuring the House that he would not trespass upon their exhausted attention more than a very few moments, which all those around and behind him, as he spoke from the front of the Opposition benches, said, was a sure prelude to a very long speech; and they were right, for Mr. Baring spoke for nearly two hours; and he being also a very slow, and heavy, and tedious speaker, many members, before exhausted with their overstrained attention to the subject, fell fast asleep. Mr. Baring supported Sir James Graham's views; and Sir Robert Peel, who sat near him on his right hand, paid the deepest attention to his speech. The Tories, who sit in a cluster, from the front of the Opposition bench ranging upwards behind on the immediate left of the Speaker's chair, were vociferous in their cheers, and gave the speakers on their side the most hearty support. When it is considered that Mr. Baring is believed to have no less than three millions sterling invested chiefly in land—Sir Robert Peel two millions in the same manner—and the 150 persons forming the Tory party, though fewer in numbers, having more land than all the remaining 500 Whigs and Liberals of the House put together—no wonder that they make so determined a stand to keep things as they are. It is worthy of remark, however, that the same Mr. Alexander Baring, now one of the largest landowners in the House of Commons, and member for the agricultural county of Essex, was, when in business as a merchant in 1815, as strenuous an opponent of the Corn Laws as he is now their defender. During that year he was accompanied through Palace Yard by thousands of the populace of London,



following him down to the House of Commons, where he was going to present petitions against the Corn Laws, as the friend of the people and the advocate of cheap bread; and Mr. Hume, in his reply, produced great effect by reading from one of Mr. Baring's speeches on that occasion passages containing the strongest denunciations of all attempts to bolster up rents by increasing the duties on foreign corn; and contending that the agricultural labourers were not benefitted by such protections, as it was purely for the advantage of the landlords at the expense of all other classes of the community.

- Mr. Fryer, of Wolverhampton, said a few words only against the Corn Laws; and Mr. Whitmore, his colleague, spoke at some length on the same side, but amidst such noise and interruption, that it was difficult to understand more than the general purport of his speech.

Lord Althorp followed, and made the singular admission, that though he agreed in theory with those who thought the Corn Laws of no benefit to the landowner, yet, as he thought the present not the proper time to make any change, he should oppose a direct negative to the motion of Mr. Hume; or in other words say, that it was a question which ought not now to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Handley, of Lincolnshire, Mr. Cutlar Fergusson, of Kirkcudbright, Sir George Phillips of Warwickshire, and Mr. W. Duncombe, of Yorkshire, all large landed proprietors, and representing great agricultural counties, spoke in favour of the Corn Laws. Lord Palmerston made exactly the same admission as Lord Althorp, as to his opinion being against the Corn Laws, though his vote would be for leaving them untouched at present. Mr. Brotherton, of Salford, made a few observations only in support of the motion; and Lord Howick followed on the same side, though representing a purely agricultural district, and expressed his belief that the Corn Laws were the chief cause of the depression of agriculture itself.

It was past one o'clock when the division was called for; and the exhaustion and weariness of all who remained to that late hour, was visible in every countenance. The most intense interest was felt in the result, though it was not at all doubtful. It was remarked that there was not a single Tory that went out in support of Mr. Hume's motion, so that the people will know what to expect from a Tory government or a Tory House of Commons: and when the numbers were announced, namely, 312, in favour of retaining the present Corn Laws unaltered, and only 155 for revising them, or two to one in favour of the landed interest, and against the shipping, mercantile, and manufacturing, the victorious party evinced their joy by loud and long continued cheers.

We had intended to have appended some remarks of our own on the question here. But other opportunities will occur when our space may be less crowded, of which we shall gladly avail ourselves. In the meantime we can only express our conviction that unless the Government take the initiative in this matter, and come boldly forward to give the people the relief they fairly claim, the business of petitioning will be changed for a less respectful mode of expressing public opinion; the Ministry will be as surely and as deservedly displaced, for opposing a more free trade in Corn, as their predecessors were for opposing a more extended representation of the people in Parliament; and the Ministry that succeeds it, profiting by the errors of the present, will establish

their power on the broad foundation of concession to the popular will' and put an end to the reign of Toryism and Whiggism alike for ever' The present Ministers have had such opportunities of doing good, and rendering their Government useful and popular, as men never had before. They have thrown away the golden gift; and if they fall, it will be without that sympathy which is ever extended to men who do their best, though they perish in the attempt. Their end will be as inglorious, as their beginning was full of hope and promise.

## MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SINCE our last publication there has been no great or important debate on any national subject, except that on the Corn Laws, which extended over two entire sittings, being the longest debate by far that has taken place during the present session, and undoubtedly the most important. We have accordingly given to it that extended space which the vast national magnitude of the question demands; and this must be our apology for glancing thus briefly at the other topics that have engaged the attention of the House.

On Monday, the 10th inst., the morning sitting was attended by nearly 300 members, which is about six times the average morning attendance. Our readers will imagine that it was some great national question, affecting the liberties or the happiness of the people, that thus brought their representatives together at so early a period of the day. Not at all. The question which filled the House, and for which as much canvassing had been practised by the agents on both sides as if it were a contested election, was, whether a Bill, authorizing the construction of the Great Western Railway, from London to Bristol, should or should not be read a second time; a question, no doubt, of considerable importance, but not nearly so much so as many others that could not command the attendance of 100 members, because there were no such private and pecuniary interests at stake. The Bill was defended by the Earl of Kerry, Lord Lansdowne's eldest son, in a very neat and appropriate speech, and opposed by the Marquis of Chandos, Mr. R. Palmer, and others. The following short extract, from the report of the debate, will show how this large morning meeting was obtained.

MR. GIBBONNE said he had been favoured, in common with many other hon. members, with a card, which he would read for the information of the house, and which he thought threw some light upon the nature of the opposition to the present bill. "Opposition to the Western Railway.—The Duke of Buckingham, the Countess of Berkeley, the Earls of Jersey, Harrington, and Cadogan, the Lords Boston, Montagu, and Stowell, Lady Carr, Mr. Sloane Stanley, Colonel Gore Langton, Mr. Robert Palmer, the Provost, Fellows, and Masters of Eton College, and the other opponents of this measure, earnestly entreat the favour of your attendance in the House of Commons on Monday, the 10th instant, at twelve o'clock, upon the motion for the second reading." He thought that was one of the most impertinent pieces of canvassing he had ever recollected. (Laughter.)

The second reading was carried by a majority of 182 to 92 ; several members having gone away before the division came on.

In the evening sitting, Mr. Cutlar Fergusson presented a petition from Captain Ross, the Polar Navigator, praying for remuneration for his losses in his late expedition. Mr. Hutt presented a petition from Hull, and Lord Sandon presented a petition from Liverpool, both to the same effect. Lord Althorp having signified his Majesty's assent to the presentation of the petition (which is a necessary preliminary to any prayer for remuneration), Mr. Fergusson gave notice, that on Wednesday, when the House should go into a Committee of Supply, he would move an Address to the Crown, praying his Majesty to bestow some mark of his royal favour on Captain Ross, for his services in his late voyage to the North Pole.

The discussion on the Army Estimates occupied the remainder of the evening, during which a division took place on the question of voting 82,179*l.* for the yeomanry, or volunteer corps of England, the opponents to the vote contending that the paid yeomanry were more frequently the disturbers than they were the preservers of the public peace, and that the civil power was quite competent to effect the purposes for which these corps were profusely kept up. We have given a List of the Minority in the usual place, the division being : For the grant of the proposed sum 135 : Against it 52.

Lord John Russell moved the second reading of his Bill for preventing Bribery at Elections, which, after a short discussion, was agreed to ; and after that, the noble Lord brought in his Bill for regulating the Marriages of Dissenters, which was read a first time, and ordered to be printed. The following extract from the report of the proceedings will be read with interest, and will guide the Dissenting body in the course they should take.

On moving that it be read a second time on the 28th of April, the noble lord said, that he would not then enter into any details of the subject. He felt that much misrepresentation had gone abroad respecting the bill, and that the nature of its provisions had not been well considered ; but though he felt this, he was not very sanguine that the measure itself would be acceptable to the great body of those for whose relief it was intended. He would now move that it be read a second time on the 28th of April, and that it be printed, and he put it off to that distant day in order to give an opportunity to the body of Dissenters, for whom he had the highest respect, to make their objections. If those objections should be found very strong, he would say, that he should not press the measure, though he did not see that he could make any material alterations in it ; still, however, he would not press it if the objections against it should be found insuperable by those for whose relief it was intended.

On Tuesday, the morning sitting was occupied with a long and desultory discussion on the presentation of a Petition from the Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations—of Baptists, Independents, and Presbyterians—in and near London, which was brought up by Dr. Lushington. The discussion chiefly turned on the question, whether the Dissenters generally desired the separation of Church and State or not ; and the result of the discussion appeared to be a general admission that all the Dissenters objected on principle to any connexion whatever between Church and State, as unscriptural and productive of great injury to both ; and that consequently they desired the separation as a matter of public benefit ; but that they did not wish *at present* to agitate this question, being desirous, *first*, of obtaining relief from the

four great grievances, so often enumerated, of which they complained; and when these were removed, they would be enabled to judge whether the union of Church and State still continued to be as objectionable as they undoubtedly thought it at present.

In the evening sitting, a long discussion occurred on a motion of Mr. O'Connell's, for the appointment of a Select Committee to take into consideration the Oaths taken by Members of the House of Commons, with a view to abolish them all, and to substitute a solemn declaration instead. He grounded his argument chiefly on the fact that at present the Protestant Member took one description of oath, the Catholic Member another, and the Quaker and the Moravian were exempted from taking any oath at all; and if the Jews were admitted into Parliament, they, perhaps, would have some other form prescribed for them. He thought them all unnecessary; and when doubts existed as to the particular construction to be placed on the several forms, he thought the best way was to have these doubts removed, and some form of declaration substituted, in which all could agree. Lord Althorp opposed the motion in a short speech; and Mr. Langdale, of Beverley, an English Catholic Member, supported Mr. O'Connell's views in an argumentative and effective address. Sir Robert Peel opposed the motion also. Dr. Lushington made decidedly the best speech on the subject, which we give almost entire, for the sound views and valuable truths it contains.

Dr. LUSHINGTON said that his opinion was that no oaths whatever ought to be required from members of Parliament. Referring to the history of past times, he was of opinion that oaths upon political subjects were of no benefit. When sufficient inducements were held out, there was no sanctity in oaths sufficient to prevent their infraction. He strongly objected to our present system of rendering admission into Parliament dependent upon the qualification of an oath. It was opposed to such a free choice of representatives as the people of England ought to have in a reformed Parliament. The people of England were competent to choose the individuals to whom their interests ought to be confided. He believed that they were capable of selecting for their representatives individuals who from their political character, from their regard to the different duties of life, and from the esteem in which they were held by their fellow-citizens, were fit to be intrusted with the great duty of legislating for this kingdom. He saw no reason why members of Parliament should enter into that house fettered and hampered by oaths. He saw no reason why any man—no matter whether he was a member of the Church of England, or a Dissenter, or a Roman Catholic—should have his lips closed by an oath, and should so be prevented from stating any sentiment which, in his judgment, contained the truth. (Hear, hear.) Why did the house seek to shut up the windows of truth? Why, if it had confidence in the present constitution of church and state, did it seem afraid of reiterated discussion upon that constitution? Why was it apprehensive that truth would not be prominent, whatever arguments might be urged against it? (Hear, hear.) For these reasons he was opposed to the imposition of these oaths, into which the hon. and learned member for Dublin now wished inquiry to be made. Was that a right example to hold up to the people of England? He wished the house had courage to do that which was right and to purge away entirely this desecrating system of oaths. He wished the house would teach the country, by such a measure, to be careful in its selection of individuals for the functions of legislation, to choose none but those in whose honour it could trust, and to place no man worthy of such trust under the obligation of an oath. During the five years which had just elapsed a great change had been effected in the manners and feelings of the people. The question imperatively demanded inquiry, for if the taking of oaths was to be abolished on the general principle, the sooner it was done the better. In matters where only trifling impediments were to be overcome the boldest statesman was

the best—a statesman who was prepared to sweep away the follies perpetuated by those who had gone before us. Statesmen of this determined stamp were then now to gain the confidence and support of the people of England, and their names handed down to posterity. (Hear, hear.)

Sir Robert Inglis and Mr. Secretary Stanley spoke against the motion, and the discussion was prolonged till half-past ten, having lasted four hours, without any practical result, as Mr. O'Connell ultimately withdrew his motion for the present, and gave notice of its reintroduction on some future day.

Sir Andrew Agnew then rose to ask leave to bring in two Bills for enforcing a better observance of the Sabbath, one for England, the other for Scotland, which, after a short conversation, was granted to him. A third Bill, connected with the same subject, did not, however, meet with so favourable a reception. It was one for granting power to the local authorities of counties, to alter the fairs and markets now held on Saturdays and Mondays, to some other days in the week, on the ground that all such fairs or markets held on either of these days, necessarily broke in upon the rest of the Sabbath. The same parties, however, who assented to the introduction of the first bill, for enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, objected to this for changing the days of fairs and markets; and the reasons assigned for the opposition showed clearly the limits to which the opponents of the bill would go. No one pretended to deny that if there were a late market on Saturday, and an early one on Monday, the repose of the Sabbath *must* be broken in upon by all those who were engaged as sellers in either. But, it was said, it will “affect the interests of the corn dealers and cattle sellers, it will injure property, and put profits in jeopardy, and therefore it cannot be permitted.” We fear that this spirit of balancing God and Mammon against each other will be found, too prevalent in all classes. The advocates of the better observance of the Sabbath will not go all the lengths that the strict observance of that day would require. They will not interdict the mail from travelling, nor shut up all the post-offices of the country, nor prevent ships sailing, on a Sunday; for that would be to cramp and injure all commercial operations. They will not prohibit the King and his Court from taking their airing in the parks, nor the nobility from travelling to the country, nor the Ministers from holding Cabinet councils, nor the Bishops from giving Sunday dinners, nor the ostentatious from driving in their gay carriages to church on a Sunday, because it would interfere with the privileged classes;—they are therefore inconsistent with themselves, and the poor will not believe them in earnest, while they let the rich escape. Again, the opponents of the measure will allow the Bill to come in, and say they admit the principle of legislating for the better observance of the Lord's Day; but whenever a case is presented, in which large pecuniary interests are to be interfered with, such as changing the days of fairs and markets, they object to any interference with this, because it will affect men's worldly profits. These are equally inconsistent with the supporters of the Bill; for if the principle be a sound one, which we very much doubt, that the Legislature of any country has a right to enforce, by penalties and coercion, any one observance that is purely religious, than has it the same right to enforce any other observance equally of a religious nature, and thus the principle of religious liberty would be entirely destroyed. That the observance of one day of rest in seven,

is a highly beneficial institution, in a physical and moral point of view, quite apart from religious considerations, we have no doubt whatever; and we think it could be demonstrated to be highly advantageous to all parties in the state. But, as to any particular mode of enjoying that day of rest, it must, we think, be left to the individual himself to choose: always taking care, of course, to protect the public health, public morals, and the public peace, from violation, by any gross abuse of the privilege which this day of rest conferred. We think, indeed, that it is a matter which could be more advantageously taken up by a Society for *encouraging* the appropriate observance of the Lord's Day, by sermons, lectures, tracts, rewards, and inducements, than by an Act of Parliament for *enforcing*, by pains and penalties, an observance which, if regarded as a religious duty, must be divested of all religious value whenever effected by coercion against the will. By reasoning and persuasion, men would soon find it their interest and their happiness to join in encouraging, by precept and example, the universal observance of the Sabbath as a day, of innocent recreation and enjoyment—of devotional feeling—and of mental and bodily purification and repose. But the moment that pains and penalties are substituted for persuasion, the human mind resists every species of coercion; and this, added to the certainty that the rich will not submit to be placed on exactly the same footing as the poor in this matter; will revolt all who regard religion as equally binding on all classes—who know that God himself is no respecter of persons—and who demand that all religious obligations shall be held equally binding on the peasant and the peer.

A call of the House was agreed to on the motion of Mr. Spring Rice, for the 15th of April, when the Repeal of the Union between England and Ireland is to be discussed, with a distinct pledge that the call would be *enforced*, if the motion should come on upon the day named.

Mr. Tennyson postponed his motion for the Repeal of the Septennial Act, and the substitution of Triennial Parliaments, to the earliest open day, the 15th of May; and Mr. Robinson withdrew his motion for a call of the House on the 25th of March.

The House did not adjourn till past one o'clock. It is gradually sliding into its old practice of sitting at late hours: but though every one seems to complain of this as an evil, very few Members appear yet disposed to support the only true remedy: namely, a total abandonment of all night sittings, and the substitution of the more rational hours of 10 to 6 in the day, which is quite as great an extent of time as is occupied now, and far more fresh and business-like hours, than from 5 in the evening to 1 in the morning. We fear we must have a new Parliament, however, before we shall have any beneficial change in this respect.

#### EVILS OF THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

THE alliance between Church and State is, in a political point of view, extremely suspicious, and much better fitted to the genius of an arbitrary than a free Government. To the former it may yield a powerful support, to the latter it must ever prove dangerous. The spiritual submission it exacts is unfavourable to mental vigour, and prepares the way for a servile acquiescence in the encroachments of civil authority. This is so correspondent with facts, that the epithet, "High Church," when applied to politics, is familiarly used to convey the notion of arbitrary maxims of government.—*Robert Hall.*

## PLAN FOR PREPARING BOYS FOR THE NAVAL SERVICE, IN THE PRINCIPAL HARBOURS OF ENGLAND.

SIR,

12, *South Hill, Stoke Devonport, Jan. 17, 1834.*

I presume to lay before you what I conceive to be an efficient and economical plan for training up stout, healthy boys, or active young men, for the future manning of His Majesty's Navy. Prime seamen are evidently even now scarce, with a probability, from various causes, of their being yet scarcer; and ships of the line are now a long time in completing their complement of able seamen even on the peace establishment. Conceiving, however, that promptness and expedition are the very soul of the Naval Service, I am induced to propose to you, for the purpose of instructing stout, healthy boys, or active young men, in the common duties of Seamanship, that there be some roomy vessels commissioned for that purpose, to remain one in each of the principal naval harbours, and to be supplied with gun-brigs, masts, yards, rigging, and sails, which may be all old or unseaworthy stores, and to be allowed also a small sailing tender, fitted with a wheel, for the purpose of learning the aspiring boys to steer and heave the lead round about the harbour, or occasionally to go out to sea. The whole establishment of instruction, at each port, to be under the command and superintendence of an experienced, zealous officer, having under his orders a few good, old, thorough-bred seamen, for the express purpose of instructing the boys in fitting every part of the ship's rigging, and to rig every mast and yard in the ship; also to bend sails, to exercise in reefing and furling sails; to be also taught the improved great gun exercise, the use of the broadsword, musket, &c. When they should be sufficiently instructed and well-grounded in the common duties of seamanship (which the young sailors will never forget), then let them unbend sails, unrig the yards and masts, carefully unfit all the rigging, and lay every thing in readiness for instructing another party of stout, healthy boys, in the same manner. Those young sailors who have been instructed on board the ship in the rudiments of military seamanship, might be immediately entered on board sea-going ships (when a limited time of servitude should be fixed), and where they should be encouraged to exert themselves to the utmost to learn, and to do all the duties of an able seamen, as soon as possible.

I heartily wish that this *vital* and *most important* object was more attended to, as I am certain that better and fitter seamen can be reared in His Majesty's Navy at much less expense to the country, than can now be procured by Impressment, even were it necessary to resort to such a *harsh* measure. The best merchant seamen when impressed are utterly deficient in the military part of their duty, and they have much to acquire and learn when first received on board ships of war. Be assured, sir, there is a great deficiency of prime, active, robust seamen now in the merchant service, and that nursery for rearing seamen for the Navy is much depreciated, partly owing to the employment of cheaper foreigners, the general introduction of steam coasters, with other causes, that have a tendency to weaken the strength and energy of the British merchant seamen. I speak, sir, from my own experience, having been regularly bred to the sea in the merchant service before I entered His Majesty's Navy; and since I have held a commission as Lieutenant I have commanded a merchant ship in the West India and also in the East India trades.

It is worthy of remark that we never send marines on board ship, or soldiers into the field, without first instructing them and training them for immediate service. Surely the young seamen should not be neglected by his country, but instructed and trained to his duty, and encouraged by every possible means to fear God, honour the King, and to serve his country faithfully and cheerfully. With the highest respect,

I remain, Sir, your most obedient and very humble Servant,

CHARLES HALL, LIEUT. R.N.

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

## LIST OF THE MAJORITY OF 220,

Tellers included, who voted against Mr. Buckingham's Motion, on the 4th of March, 1834, That a Select Committee be appointed to take into consideration the practicability of devising some plan by which a regular and voluntary supply of Seamen may be procured for his Majesty's Navy, without recourse to the practice of forcible Impressment.

For the Motion	:	:	:	:	:	132
Against it	:	:	:	:	:	220

## ENGLAND.

Althorp, Lord	Foley, E. T.	Madocks, J.	Scott, Sir E. D.
Bankes, W. J.	Fox, Colonel	Mangles, James	Sebright, Sir J.
Baring, F. T.	Fremantle, Sir T.	Margjoribanks, Stuart	Sheppard, T.
Benett, J.	Gaskell, J. M.	Marshall, John	Skipwith, Sir G.
Bentinck, Lord G. F.	Gisborne, T.	Martin, John	Smith, J. A.
Berkeley, Hon. G. C.	Gordon, R.	Maxfield, Captain	Smith, R. V.
Berkeley, Hon. C. F.	Goring, H. D.	Mildmay, P. St. J.	Stanley, Hon. E. G. S.
Bernal, R.	Graham, Sir J.	Moreton, Hon. A. H.	Stanley, Hon. H. T.
Bethell, E. R.	Grant, Right Hon. R.	Morpeth, Viscount	Stanley, E.
Biddulph, R.	Grey, Colonel	Mostyn, Hon. E. M.	Stewart, J.
Blunt, Sir C. R.	Grey, Sir G.	Miles, William E.	Seymour, Lord
Bolling, W.	Gronow, Captain	Neale, Adm. Sir H. B.	Stromont, Viscount
Boss, J. G.	Grosvenor, Lord R.	Nicholl, J.	Strickland, G.
Brocklehurst, J.	Handley, W. F.	North, F.	Surrey, Earl of
Bruce, Lord E.	Handley, H.	Penleaze, J. S.	Talbot, W. H. F.
Buller, J. W.	Hardinge, Sir H.	Paget, Sir C.	Tancred, H. W.
Buller, E.	Heathcote, J. J.	Palmer, C. F.	Tennyson, Rt. Hon. C.
Bullock, J. C.	Heathcote, G. J.	Palmer, R.	Thompson, P. B.
Burdett, Sir F.	Henage, G. F.	Palmerston, Viscount	Thomson, Rt. Hon. C. P.
Burrell, Sir C.	Heron, Sir R.	Parker, J.	Todd, R.
Buton, H.	Herries, Rt. Hon. J.	Parker, Sir H.	Torrens, Colonel
Bouverie, Hon. D. P.	Hodges, T. L.	Pechell, Sir S. J. B.	Tower, C. T.
Calvert, N.	Hodgson, J. C.	Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir R.	Townshend, Lord C.
Carter, J. B.	Hoskins, K.	Pelham, Hon. C. A.	Tracy, C. H.
Cavendish, Lord	Lotham, Lord	Pendarves, E. W.	Trevor, Hon. G. R.
Cayley, Sir G.	Howard, P. H.	Petre, Hon. E.	Trounbridge, Sir E. T.
Cayley, E. S.	Howick, Viscount	Phillpotts, J.	Tullamore, Lord
Chaplin, Colonel T.	Hyett, W. H.	Punney, W.	Tyrell, C.
Childers, J. W.	Irton, S. W.	Price, Sir R.	Vivyan, Sir R.
Clive, Hon. R. H.	Inglis, Sir R.	Ramsden, J. C.	Wedgewood, J.
Cockerell, Sir C.	James, W.	Rice, Hon. T. S.	Wilbraham, G.
Crawley, S.	Jermyn, Earl	Ridley, Sir M. W.	Willoughby, Sir H.
Crawford, W.	Jerringham, Hon. H.	Robarts, A. W.	Wandham, W. H.
Darlington, Earl of	Johnstone, Sir J. V.	Rolfe, R. M.	Wood, Colonel T.
Denison, J. E.	Keppel, Major G.	Rooper, J. B.	Wood, C.
Divett, E.	Kerrison, Sir E.	Ross, C.	Wall, C. B.]
Donkin, Sir R. S.	Kerry, Earl of	Rotch, B.	Ward, H. G.
Dundas, Capt. J. W.	Labouchere, H.	Russell, Lord J.	Warre, J. A.
Dundas, Hon. Sir R.	Lemon, Sir C.	Russell, Lord	Waterpark, Lord
Duncannon, Visc.	Lefevre, C. S.	Russell, Lord C. J. F.	Watkins, L. }
Ebrington, Viscount	Lenard, Sir T. B.	Ryle, J.	Weyland, Major R. }
Egerton, W. T.	Lennox, Lord G.	Scrope, C. P.	Whitbread, W. H.
Ellice, E.	Lennox, Lord A.	Sandon, Viscount	Whitmore, W. W.
Etwall, R.	Littleton, E. J.	Sanford, E.	Wrottesley, Sir J.
Finch, G.	Lumley, Viscount	Scarlett, Sir J.	Wynn, Rt. Hon. C. W.
Fleetwood, P. H.	Lygon, Hon. Col. H.	Scott, J. W.	Yorke, Captain C. P.
Foley, J. H. H.	Lyall, George		



## SCOTLAND.

Adam, Admiral C.	Dunlop, Captain J.	Hay, Colonel A.	Macleod, R.
Arbuthnot, Hon. H.	Elliot, Hon. Capt. G.	Jeffrey, Rt. Hon. F.	Murray, J.
Bruce, C.	Gordon, Hon. Capt. W.	Johnstone, J. J.	Ormelie, Earl of
Callender, J.	Grant, Rt. Hon. C.	Loch, J.	Pringle, R.
Dalmeny, Lord			

## IRELAND.

Belfast, Earl of	Corry, Hon. H. L.	Howard, R.	Knox, Hon. Col. J. J.
Browne, J.	Dobbin, L.	Jephson, C. D. O.	Meynell, Captain H.
Browne, D.	Hayes, Sir E.	Jones, Captain T.	Talbot, J.
Conolly, Col. E. M.	Hill, Lord A.		

TELLERS.—Capt. Elliott.—Lord Duncannon.

## LIST OF THE MAJORITY OF 314.

Tellers included, who, on the 6th of March, voted against the motion of Mr. Hume, "That this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, to consider the Corn Laws (9 Geo. IV., c. 60), and substituting, instead of the present graduated Scale of Duties, a fixed and moderate Duty on the Import at all times of Foreign Corn into the United Kingdom, and for granting a fixed and equivalent Bounty on the Export of Corn from the United Kingdom.

For the motion	: : : : : 157
Against it	: : : : : 314

## ENGLAND.

Althorp, Lord	Cavendish, Hon. Col.	Foley, E. T.	Herries, Rt. Hon. J.
Anson, Hon. G.	Cayley, Sir G.	Foley, J. N. N.	Hill, Sir R.
Astley, Sir J. D.	Cayley, E. S.	Folkes, Sir W.	Hodges, T.
Astley, Sir J.	Chandos, Marquis	Forester, Hon. W.	Hornby, E. G.
Atherley, A.	Chaplin, Colonel T.	Fox, S. L.	Hoskins, K.
Attwood, M.	Chapman A.	Frankland, Sir R.	Hotham, Lord
Bankes, W. J.	Chetwynd, Capt. W.	Frenfante, Sir T.	Houldsworth, T.
Baring, A.	Childers, J. W.	Gaskell, J.	Howard, P. H.
Baring, H. B.	Clayton, Colonel R.	Gladstone, W.	Hope, H. T.
Bell, M.	Clive, E. B.	Glynne, Sir S.	Hudson, T.
Benett, J.	Clive, Hon. R. H.	Gordon, R.	Hurst, R. H.
Bentinck, Lord G. F.	Cocke, Sir C.	Goring, H. D.	Irton, S.
Berkeley, Hon. C. F.	Collier, J.	Goulburn, Hon. H.	Inglby, Sir W. A.
Barnard, E. G.	Cookes, T. H.	Graham, Sir J. R.	Ingils, Sir R.
Bethell, E. R.	Cooper, Hon. A. H.	Grant, Rt. Hon. R.	Jermyn, Earl of
Bewes, T.	Cotes, J.	Greene, T. G.	Jerningham, Hon. H.
Biddulph, R.	Crawley, S.	Grey, Hon. Colonel	Johnstone, Sir J. V.
Biddulph, R. M.	Cripps, J.	Grimston, Viscount	Jolliffe, H.
Blackstone, W. S.	Crompton, J.	Gronow, Capt. R.	Keppel, Major
Blake, Sir F.	Curteis, H. B.	Grosvenor, Lord R.	Kerrison, Sir E.
Blandford, Marquis	Curteis, Captain	Guise, Sir B. W.	Kerry, Earl of
Boss, J. G.	Dare, R. H.	Halcomb, J.	Knatchbull, Sir F.
Bowes, J.	Dennison, W. J.	Halford, H.	Lambton, Hedworth
Brocklehurst, J.	Dennison, J. E.	Halse, J.	Langdale, Hon. C.
Brodie, B.	Dillwyn, L. W.	Handley, W. F.	Leech, J.
Bruce, Lord E.	Donkin, Sir R. S.	Handley, B.	Lefevre, C. S.
Brudenell, Lord	Duncombe, Hon. W.	Handley, H.	Lemon, Sir C.
Bulteel, J. C.	Dundas, Captain	Hanmer, Sir J.	Lennard, T. B.
Burrell, Sir C.	Dundas, Hon. Sir R.	Hanmer, Colonel H.	Lennard, Sir T. B.
Burton, H.	Eastnor, Viscount	Harcourt, G.	Lennox, Lord W.
Byng, G.	Egerton, W. T.	Hardinge, Sir H.	Lennox, Lord G.
Byng, Sir J.	Edwards, J.	Harland, W.	Lennox, Lord A.
Calcraft, J.	Estcourt, T. G. B.	Heathcote, J. J.	Lewis, Hon. T. F.
Calvert, N.	Fancourt, Major	Heathcote, G. J.	Lincoln, Earl of
Carter, J. B.	Fitzgibbon, R.	Heneage, G. F.	Locke, W.
Curtwright, W. R.	Finch, G.	Henniker, Lord	Lumley, Viscount
Cavendish, Hon. C.	Fitzroy, Lord C.	Herbert, Hon. S.	Lygon, Hon. Colonel
Cavendish, Lord	Fitzroy, Lord J.	Heron, Sir R.	Lyll, G.

Madocks, J.	Pepys, C. Sir	Sebright, Sir J.	Tullamore, Lord
Mangles, J.	Phillips, Sir G.	Shawe, R. N.	Tynte, C.
Marjoribanks, S.	Pigot, R.	Simeon, Sir R.	Tyrell, Sir J.
Murrayatt, J.	Pinney, W.	Skipwith, Sir G.	Tyrell, C.
Maxfield, Captain	Ponsonby, Hon. W.	Smith, J. A.	Verney, Sir H.
Mildmay, P.	Price, Sir R.	Smith, J.	Vernon, G. J.
Mills, J.	Pryme, G.	Smith, Hon. R. S.	Villiers, Viscount
Moreton, Hon. A.	Pryse, P.	Somerset, Lord G.	Vivian, J.
Moreton, Hon. H.	Ramsden, J. C.	Spry, S.	Vivyan, Sir R.
Mostyn, Hon. E.	Reid, Sir J. R.	Stanley, Hon. E.	Wilbraham, G.
Miles, W.	Richards, J.	Staunton, Sir G. T.	Williams, W.
Neale, Admiral	Rickford, W.	Staveley, J. K.	Williams, R.
Neeld, J.	Rider, I.	Stormont, Viscount	Williams, T.
Newark, Lord	Ridley, Sir M. W.	Stuart, Lord Dudley	Willoughby, Sir H.
Nicholl, J.	Robarts, A. W.	Stewart, W.	Winnington, T. G.
Norreys, Lord	Rooper, J. B.	Surrey, Earl of	Winnington, H. J.
Ossulton, Lord	Ross, C.	Talbot, C.	Windham, W.
Paget, F.	Rotch, B.	Talmash, A. G.	Wood, Colonel T.
Palmer, C. F.	Rumbold, C. E.	Tayleur, W.	Wall, C.
Palmer, R.	Russell, Lord J.	Thomson, P. B.	Ward, H.
Palmerston, Visc.	Russell, C.	Throckmorton, R.	Warre, J.
Parker, Sir H.	Russell, W.	Tower, C. T.	Watkins, L.
Pense, J.	Sanderson, R.	Townley, R. G.	Watson, Hon. R.
Peshell, Sir S. J. B.	Sandon, Viscount	Townshend, Lord C.	Weyland, Major R.
Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir R.	Sanford, E. A.	Tracy, C. H.	Whitbread, W.
Peel, Colonel J.	Scarlett, Sir J.	Trewlaney, W.	Wrottesley, Sir J.
Pelham, Hon. C.	Scott, Sir E. D.	Travdr, Hon. R.	Wynn, Right Hon. C.
Pendarves, E. W.	Scott, J. W.	Troubridge, Sir E.	Yorke, Captain C.
Penruddocke, J. H.			

## SCOTLAND.

Agnew, Sir A.	Elliott, Captain G.	Hallyburton, Hon. D.	Rae, Sir W.
Arbuthnot, Hon. H.	Ferguson, Cap. G.	Hay, Colonel A. L.	Ross, H.
Bruce, C.	Fergusson, R. C.	Jeffrey, Rt. Hon. F.	Stewart, Sir M. S.
Callender, J. H.	Gordon, Hon. Capt.	Johnstone, J. J. H.	Traill, G.
Colquhoun, J. C.	Grant, Hon. C.	Macleod, R.	Wemyss, Captain J.

## IRELAND.

Barry, G. S.	Corry, Hon. H. L.	Jephson, D. O.	Shaw, F.
Belfast, Earl of	Copeland, W. C.	Knox, Hon. Col. J.	Sheil, R. L.
Blaney, Hon. Capt.	Daly, J.	Lambert, H.	Stewart, Sir H.
Browne, D.	Dobbin, L.	Meynell, Captain H.	Sullivan, R.
Blake, M. J.	Fitzgerald, T.	O'Callaghan, Hon. C.	Talbot, J.
Castlereagh, Visc.	Gladstone, T.	O'Connor, F.	Tennent, J. E.
Christmas, J. N.	Hayes, Sir E.	O'Ferrall, R. M.	Walker, C. A.
Conolly, Colonel E.	Howard, R.	Roche, W.	Wallace, T.
Coote, Sir C. H.	Jones, Captain T.	Roe, J.	

TELLERS.—Darlington, Earl of.—Rice, Hon. T. S.

## LIST OF THE MINORITY OF 157.

Tellers included, who, on the 6th of March, voted in favour of Mr. Hume's Motion for a Committee to Inquire into the present State of the Corn Laws, with a view to establishing a fixed Duty in lieu of the present graduated Scale.

## ENGLAND.

Aglionby, H. A.	Bolling, W. J.	Bouverie, Hon. D. P.	Dawson, E.
Attwood, T.	Briggs, R.	Buxton, T. F.	Divett, E.
Baillie, J. E.	Brotherton, J.	Chichester, J. B.	Dundas, Hon. J. C.
Baines, Esq.	Brougham, W.	Clay, W.	Dundas, Hon. T.
Barnett, C. J.	Buckingham, J. S.	Crawford, W.	Dykes, F. L. B.
Bernal, R.	Buller, E.	Dashwood, G. H.	Ellice, Rt. Hon. F.
Bish, T.	Buller, J. W.	Davenport, J.	Ellis, W.
Blunt, Sir C. R.	Bulwer, H. L.	Davies, Col.	Etwell, R.

Evans, W.	Hughes, H.	Ord, W. H.	Strutt, F.
Evans, Colonel	Humphery, J.	Palmer, General	Tancred, H. W.
Ewart, W.	Hutt, W.	Parker, J.	Tennyson, Hon. C.
Faithfull, G.	Hyett, W. H.	Parrott, J.	Thicknesse, R.
Fenton, J.	Ingham R.	Philips, M.	Thompson, Ald.
Fielden, J.	James, W.	Phillpotts, J.	Thomson, Rt.Hon.P.
Feilden, W.	Jervis, J.	Penleaze, J. S.	Todd, R.
Fleetwood, H.	Kemp, T. R.	Rippon, C.	Tooke, W.
Fort, J.	Kennedy, J.	Robinson, G. R.	Turner, W.
Fox, Colonel	Lambton, Hedworth	Roebuck, J. A.	Vernon, Hon. G. J.
Fryer, R.	Langton, Col. G.	Rolfe, R. M.	Walker, R.
Gaskell, D.	Langston, J. H.	Romilly, J.	Walter, J.
Gisborne, T.	Labouchere, J. C.	Romilly, E.	Warburton, H.
Grey, Sir G.	Lester, B. L.	Ryle, J.	Waterpark, Lord
Grote, G.	Lister, E. C.	Russell, Lord	Whalley, Sir Samuel
Guest, J. J.	Littleton, Rt.Hon.E.	Scholefield, J.	Wedgewood, J.
Gully, John	Lloyd, J. H.	Sheppard, T.	Whitmore, W. W.
Hall, B.	Lushington, Dr.	Smith, V.	Wigney, I. N.
Hardy, J.	Marshall, J.	Stanley, H. T.	Wilks, J.
Harvey, D. W.	Marsland, T.	Stanley, E. J.	Williams, Colonel
Hawes, B.	Martin, J.	Scrope, P.	Wood, C.
Hawkins, J. H.	Molyneux, Lord	Seymour, Lord	Wood, Alderman
Hodgson, J.	Molesworth, Sir W.	Stewart, P. M.	Wood, G. W.
Howard, Captain	Morpeth, Viscount	Strickland, Sir G.	Young, G. F.
Howick, Lord	Morrison, J.		

## SCOTLAND.

Abercromby, Hn. J.	Ewing, J.	Ormelie, Lord	Sharpe, General
Bannerman, A.	Gillon, W. D.	Oswald, R. A.	Stewart, R.
Dalmeney, Lord	Loch, J.	Oswald, J.	Wallace, R.
Dunlop, Captain	Murray, J. A.	Parnell, Hon. Sir H.	

## IRELAND.

Evans, G.	O'Connell, M.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Ruthven, E.
Lalor, P.	O'Connell, M.	O'Reilly, William	Vigors, N. A.
O'Connell, D.	O'Connell, J.	Ruthven, E. S.	

TELLERS.—Hume, Joseph.—Torrens, Colonel

## MINORITY OF 27,

Tellers included, who voted at a quarter past 2 in the morning, "to call the attention of the House to the case of Mr. Cohen, Editor of the *Brighton Guardian*, now confined in Chelmsford Gaol, and to move for an Address for the Remission of his Sentence."

Aglionby, H. A.	Gully, J.	O'Dwyer, C. A.	Roebuck, J. A.
Blake, M. J.	Faithfull, G.	O'Connor, F.	Vigors, N. A.
Bonuelker, A. H.	Fitzsimon, C.	Ord, W. H.	Walter, J.
Blunt, Sir C.	Hawkins, J. H.	Pease, J.	Wason, R.
Buller, C.	Hume, J.	Ruthven, E. S.	Wallace, T.
Curteis, H. B.	Lalor, F.	Ruthven, E.	
Curteis, Captain	Lennox, Lord W.		

TELLERS.—Kemp, J. R.—Wigney, J.

This must have been a division of interest to the Ministry, for even at the late hour of half-past 2, Lords Althorp, Palmerston, John Russell, Howick, and Duncannon, Messrs. Rice, C. Wood, Sir J. Graham, and Sir F. Burdett, voted in the majority against the motion for a committee.

## MINORITY OF 69,

Tellers included, who voted for Mr. Hume's motion for reducing the General Staff at head-quarters from 27,120*l.* to 18,550*l.*, as recommended before the Committee on Naval and Military Expenditure, by the Right Hon. Sir H. Parnell.

For the Reduction . . . . .	60
Against it . . . . .	244

## ENGLAND.

Aglionby, H. A.	Evans, Colonel	Lloyd, J. H.	Thicknesse, R.
Baines, E.	Ewart, W.	Parrott, J.	Todd, R.
Bowes, J.	Fielden, J.	Phillips, M.	Turner, W.
Briscoe, J.	Gaskell, D.	Potter, R.	Watkins, J. L.
Brocklehurst, J.	Grote, G.	Rippon, C.	Whalley, Sir S.
Brotherton, J.	Guest, J.	Roebuck, J. A.	Wilks, J.
Bulwer, H. L.	Hall, B.	Romilly, J.	Williams, Colonel
Clav, W.	Hutt, W.	Stavelly, J. K.	Wood, Alderman
Cobbett, W.	Ingilby, Sir W.	Strutt, E.	Young, G. F.
Ellis, W.	Lister C.	Talmash, C. G.	

## SCOTLAND.

Gillon, W. D.	Murray, J. C.	Oswald, J.	Parnell, Hon. Sir H.
Maxwell, J.	Oliphant, L.		

## IRELAND,

Blake, M.	Lalor, P.	O'Connell, M.	O'Reilly, W.
Evans, G.	O'Connell, D.	O'Connor, F.	Roche, D.
Fitzgerald, T.	O'Connell, J.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Sullivan, R.
Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connell, M.		

TELLER.—Hume, J.—LOCKED OUT.—Humphery, J.

## MINORITY of 54,

Tellers included, who voted for withdrawing the vote of 82,179*l.*, proposed for the Pay of Yeomanry and Volunteer Corps for the year 1834-35.

For the Reduction . . . . .	54
For the Vote . . . . .	136

## ENGLISH.

Aglionby, H. A.	Ewart, W.	Hutt, W.	Tielawney, W.
Attwood, T.	Faithful, G.	James, W.	Turner, W.
Bowes, T.	Fielden, J.	Lennox, Lord G.	Walter, J.
Buckingham, J. S.	Guest, J. J.	Lister, E. C.	Warburton, H.
Cobbett, W.	Hawkins, J. H.	Parrott, J.	Wason, R.
Collier, J.	Handley, Major	Potter, R.	Watkins, L.
Dykes, F. L. B.	Humphery, J.	Stavelly, T. K.	Whalley, Sir S.
Evans, Colonel	Hurst, R. H.	Todd, R.	Wilks, J.

## SCOTCH.

Gillon, W. D.	Oliphant, L.	Wallace, R.	Wemyss, Captain
Johnston, A.	Oswald, R. A.		

## IRISH.

Barry, G. S.	Jacob, E.	O'Reilly, W.	Sheil, R. L.
Blake, M.	O'Connell, M.	Roche, W.	Vigors, N. A.
Evans, George	O'Connell, D.	Ruthven, E. S.	Walker, C. A.
Fitzgerald, T. J.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Ruthven, E.	

TELLER.—Hume J.

## MINORITY OF 139.

Tellers included, who, on the 11th of March, voted for Sir Andrew Agnew's motion, That leave be given to bring in a bill to enable local authorities to change Saturdays and Mondays' Fairs and Markets, to other days.

Majority	183
Minority	139

## ENGLAND.

Astley, Sir Jacob	Ebrington, Lord	Inglis, Sir R.	Ross, C.
Attwood, M.	Evans, W.	Kerrison, Sir E.	Russell, Lord J.
Baines, E.	Ewing, J.	Keppel, Hon. G.	Shawe, F.
Bewes, T.	Fancourt, Major	Lambton, Hedworth	Smith, Hon. R.
Bell, M.	Fenton, J.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Sheppard, T.
Blackstone, W. S.	Ferguson, R. C.	Lincoln, Earl of	Simeon, Sir R.
Bentinck, Lord G.	Feilden, W.	Lister, E. C.	Scott, Sir E.
Blandford, Marquis	Foley, J. H.	Lemon, Sir C.	Smith, R. Vernon
Blayney, Hon. C.	Folkes, Sir W.	Lennox, Lord A.	Stewart, Sir M. S.
Brocklehurst, J.	Forster, C. T.	Littleton, Hon. E. J.	Stuart, R.
Browne, J.	Fremantle, Sir S.	Madocks, J.	Stewart, J.
Buxton, T. F.	Gaskell, D.	Maxwell, J.	Stewart, E.
Buckingham, J. S.	Gaskell, J. M.	Morpeth, Viscount	Stanley, Hon. E. G.
Burton, H.	Gladstone, W. E.	Marryatt, J.	Stanley, E.
Burdett, Sir F.	Grosvenor, Earl	Miles, W.	Somerset, Lord G.
Bruce C. C.	Grosvenor, Lord R.	Marsland, T.	Talbot, C. R. M.
Buller, Ed.	Glynne, Sir S. R.	Meynell, Capt.	Tooke, W.
Campbell, Sir H.	Grant, Rt. Hon. C.	Neeld, J.	Tower, C. R.
Calvert, N.	Grey, Sir G.	Neale, Sir H. B.	Trevor, Hon. G. S.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Goulbourn, Hon. H.	North, F.	Todd, J. R.
Cavendish, Lord	Graham, Hon. Sir J.	Oliphant, J.	Tyrrell, Sir J.
Chapman, A.	Handley, B.	Patten, J. W.	Vernon, Hon. G. J.
Christmas, W.	Halse, J.	Paget, F.	Verney, Sir H.
Collier, J.	Halcomb, J.	Pease, J.	Walker, J.
Conolly, Col.	Henthcote, G. J.	Pinney, W.	Waterpark, Lord
Clive, Hon. R. H.	Hardy, J.	Peel, Sir R.	Watkins, T. L. V.
Curteis, H. B.	Hughes, H. H.	Ponleaze, J.	Whitmore, J. C.
Curteis, E. B.	Halford, H.	Peter, W.	Williams, W. A.
Dalmeny, Lord	Hoakins, K.	Pigot, R.	Wilks, J.
Dagdale, W. H.	Handley, W. F.	Foulter, J.	Wilbraham, G.
Duncannon, Lord	Hardinge, Sir H.	Pringle, J.	Willoughby, Sir H.
Dundas, Captain	Inglby, Sir W.	Rice, Rt. Hon. T. S.	Winnington, Sir T.
Dunlop, Captain	Johnstone, J. B. V.	Richards, J.	Whalley, Sir S.
Eastnor, Lord	Johnston, Andrew	Ridley, Sir M. W.	Wood, Col.

TELLERS.—Hodgson, J.—Agnew, Sir A.

## MINORITY OF 7.

Tellers included, who voted against the Second Reading of the Stafford Borough Disfranchisement Bill.

Disfranchisement Bill.				
For the Second Reading		.	.	167
Against it		.	.	7
Buller, E.	Gaskell, J. M.	Halcomb, J.	Lygon, Hon. H. B.	
Gronow, R. H.				

TELLERS.—Fryer, R.—Chetwynd, Captain.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

With the present Number is published a complete and Revised List of the Present House of Commons, up to the present period, in which are corrected several errors that appeared in the List published in the First Number of the present Series, for which this may be substituted.

The Present Number also contains the Title and Table of Contents of the Supplementary Volume, published during the Recess; which may be had by those who desire to complete their Sets from the beginning of the First Session of the Reformed Parliament to the present time.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1834.

REMOVAL OF THE BISHOPS—SEPARATION OF  
CHURCH AND STATE.

THE question of Church Reform is every day assuming a more imposing aspect. We have already, on several occasions, recorded our opinions on the great public advantages which would accrue from a separation of the Church from the State, and presented several Petitions to the House having this as the distinct object of their prayer; more especially a Petition from Dudley, and another from Wigan; and we are glad to find by the Petition of the great meeting at Manchester, and others from various parts of the country, that this feeling is increasing in extent and intensity every day. In connection with this subject, and as one of the steps towards such a separation, Mr. Cuthbert Rippon, the Member for Gateshead, brought forward his motion on Thursday the 13th inst., to relieve the Bishops from their political duties in the House of Lords. The House was not very fully attended on the occasion, the Ministers believing that there existed no necessity to summon their friends; and many persons favourable to the motion staying away to avoid voting on it, from a sincere, no doubt, though, we think, a mistaken belief, that the minority would be so very small that its publication would not only bring odium on those who formed members of it, but would injure the cause of the Dissenters, by alarming or irritating the friends of the Established Church. We shall give the principal speeches of the Debate, and some account of the manner in which the discussion was attempted to be stifled, which has not appeared in the newspaper reports, that our readers may see the actual position of the question, and know its advocates and opponents. Mr. Rippon's speech is reported in the first person, from which we may infer that it was written out for publication; so that it has all the advantage of undoubted authenticity, an advantage which few newspaper reports possess; and for this reason, as well as for its intrinsic excellence, we transfer it entire to our pages, but must content ourselves with giving only the substance of all the others. It is only in this way that we can hope to make our Publication answer to its title, by being rather a *Parliamentary Review* than a *Parliamentary Register*. By excluding the vast mass of those proceedings that are neither important nor interesting, we are enabled to give full and accurate reports of those which are both; and though our readers

will not find *every thing* in our pages, we shall take care that whatever they *do* find there shall be worthy of national attention.

Mr. RIPPON said, I am aware that an appeal to the indulgence of this house may be deemed the customary preface of every unpractised member, but I can truly aver, that looking to the importance of the subject I am about to bring under its notice, and knowing the feebleness of my ability to do justice to its merits, I am only sustained in my undertaking by a reliance on that generous and impartial feeling, which will not under-estimate the worthiness of a measure by reason of the inefficient arguments of its humble proposer. I am not incited by desire of popularity or love of novelty. I offer this proposition with a sincere and long-formed conviction of its necessity and its justice. I wish to irritate no private feelings, I desire to enlist no party passion. I will endeavour to state my opinions calmly, fairly, and briefly. It were unnecessary at this day to cite authorities showing the propriety of church reform, but I cannot forbear calling the attention of the house to the opinions of one for whose conservative wisdom they will entertain sincere respect—I mean Lord Bacon, who, when addressing his royal master on the “better pacification and edification of the Church of England,” thus expresses himself:—“I would only ask *why* the civil state should be purged and restored by good and wholesome laws, made every third or fourth year, in Parliament assembled, devising remedies as fast as time breedeth mischief, and contrariwise, the ecclesiastical state should still continue upon the dregs of time, and receive no alteration now for these five-and-forty years and more.” Two hundred years, Sir, have since passed away, and the establishment continues “upon the dregs of time;” a revolt has now taken place in the minds of men; the intelligent community loudly demand a reform in the church establishment, and it is the duty of this house to examine into that institution, and make it satisfactory to the views of the people. I maintain, Sir, that it is the first duty of civil government to afford satisfaction to those by whose voluntary obedience it is instituted and maintained, and never to forget the immense importance of timely concession. Observe the signs of growing discontent; reform your system before the period of agitation arrives, for then it may be done with more effect and with a better grace. Remember the reformation advanced by the determined non-compliance of its supporters, and be assured that no resistance to national grievance is so invincible as a calm resolution not to obey.

I will not fatigue the patience of the house by referring to periods long passed by. I will not consider whether the right of bishops to sit in Parliament is by prescription, or in respect of fictional baronies. I will not discuss whether they sat in the Saxon courts as judges or as peace-makers. I will not debate the clerical position, that the lords spiritual at this day form a third and independent estate in the other House of Parliament. I will not search the records of history to discover a precedent for my present measure. Time, Sir, changes the position of circumstances, and it also increases the capacity of the human mind to judge soundly on public affairs; for this reason, therefore, I prefer the judgment of our own age to that of any by-gone period. I must entreat the house to bear in mind this one important fact, that the superior knowledge and education of the clergy in all countries and at all times has enabled them to maintain a delusive influence over an ignorant and superstitious people; and formerly in this country, when the laity gave little consideration but to feats of arms and hospitality—when nobles were unlettered, and kings could scarcely sign their names, the clergy became desirable, if not necessary adjuncts in civil government; and from the time of Beckett to that of Sir Thomas More, a period of nearly 450 years, the office of Chancellor, or Lord Keeper, the highest civil office in the state, was filled almost uniformly by an ecclesiastic; and prior to the reformation there sat in the other House of Parliament 2 archbishops, 24 bishops, 26 or 27 mitred abbots, and 2 priors—in all a body of 54 or 55 ecclesiastical persons, nearly equalling in their number the temporal nobility of that time. The cause which formerly warranted this practice exists no longer. That which was then desirable is now useless, and if continued, will become dangerous. I offer this as a first step in church reform. I consider that it is our duty to begin with the heads of the establishment, and thus show to the inferior clergy our impartiality and our justice; by this means we shall strengthen the effect of our future mea-

sures in regard to them, by evidence of our sincere and honest course in respect of the hierarchy. I ask this house, Sir, to consider and decide whether it be meet and useful that the heads of a Christian church, whose duty it is to retire from the world, not meddling in affairs of state, whose profession is humility, whose renouncement hath been the pomps and vanities of this wicked world—is it proper that such should be made agents in political affairs, and clothed with temporal splendour?—is it right to impose legislative duties upon those who are set apart from the rest of the people for the service of God, whose proper business is the care of the churches committed to their charge?

What are the crying evils of the present system? Pluralities, non-residence, and unequal distribution of wealth. You create a plurality of duties by placing political power in the hands of spiritual teachers. You cause non-residence by requiring the absence of the overseer from his diocese to attend his duties in Parliament; and by the same act you afford an excuse for the unequal apportionment of wealth, by the ever ready plea of extraordinary expenses created by this political abduction; you bring them, bedizened with the splendour of title, to mix in the amusements of a metropolis—to mingle in the plots and jobs of Government intrigue; you tempt them to gratify pride, avarice, luxury, and indolence; you shower wealth and splendour upon them; you forget they are but men. Before I proceed further with my objections, I will, with the leave of the house, examine the merits of that argument ever employed in defence of the practice of bishops sitting in the House of Lords, that by so doing they represent the clergy, and thus watch over the spiritual and temporal interests of the church. In the first place, let me ask, are the bishops chosen by the clergy? No, they are ordained, and virtually appointed by the Crown. How then can a bishop be called the representative of his clergy, when they have no voice in his election,—when he is, in fact, a mere state-made father in God? Have they any veto in ecclesiastical questions? Can they enjoin one rite or ceremony? Can they establish or annul one article of faith? No, Sir, all power and jurisdiction relating to these matters, is lodged in the hands of the King and Parliament. It is not then preposterous to suppose that 30 united voices in an assembly of more than 400 persons can have any controlling influence?—does not reason assure us, that all just and proper measures for the government of the church, which might be recommended by the bishops out of Parliament, would be received with equal attention by both houses of Legislature and by the people with less suspicion and distrust than when advocated in the Senate by interested parties, to whom public feeling is frequently adverse? Besides, be it remembered, the clergy, equally as the members of our other institutions, enjoy the right of voting as freeholders in respect of their property for the election of representatives in this house; and if the advice or opinion of the church upon ecclesiastical matters were required in another place, let the bishops be summoned in the same manner as the judges.

The only advantages that I can discover in the present system, if such the friends of the establishment deem them to be, are these—that the church obtains a share in civil government, and the chief magistrate has control over spiritual concerns. Thus one usurpation is balanced by another. The power of appointing to the episcopal bench is placed in the hands of a Minister, and we know that private interest, political intrigue, and courtly favour, have sometimes offered stronger recommendations than pious worth. The system of translation makes them, in a certain degree, dependent on ministerial favour, and subjects them to the trying temptation of yielding their integrity to their interest. But, Sir, we must take another view of this question. It is proper to consider political tendencies,—to reflect whether it is not the interest of certain men to maintain things as they are, to resist innovation, and prevent the diffusion of political truth,—to consider whether the possession of state patronage, which both enriches and exalts, must not necessarily create an adverseness to that change by which its wealth and eminence may be diminished; and it is right to review the past conduct of parties, and see whether private pretensions have not frequently been preferred to national advantage. Now, Sir, I will take upon myself unhesitatingly to assert that the tendency of all church establishments connected with the state has been, and must be, to oppose political improvements; they are aware that no change



can probably increase, but may possibly diminish, the wealth and advantages of the establishment; they know that the bonds of ecclesiastical delusion which have bound the powers of human reason for past centuries are now burst asunder—that public judgment, now set free, will exercise its powers in judging for itself, in discovering the truth; therefore, to maintain themselves as they are, they will resolutely oppose any change in the forms of that government by which their supremacy is upheld, lest political reformation might weaken or endanger it. To review the past conduct of parties, turn to the page of history. The church maintained the despotism of Louis in France, of Ferdinand in Spain, of Miguel in Portugal; and though, as I am aware, the clergy of our own country refer with triumphant exultation, to the conduct of the bishops in the time of James II., still, be it remembered, this instance of departure from their usual practice affords the strongest conformation of the rule; for their support of the executive power was only withdrawn when James had disclosed his purpose of substituting Popery for Protestantism, and therefore their fears were at best of a mixed character, for religious truth and for their civil immunities,—for the supremacy of their church, and for the preservation of their church establishment. I need not refer to that period when the rejection of the Reform Bill in another place brought this country to the brink of revolution. The facts of that time and later periods are sufficiently well known to every one here present to enable them to form a correct judgment whether the political power of the bishops in Parliament has been employed in support of pure and good measures, such as would probably increase the public content and welfare, or whether they have been the mere partizans of their respective political creators.

I have trespassed too long on the time of the house. (Cries of “No, no,” and cheers.) It has been my desire to show that the plea of exclusive learning, which formerly might have justified the employment of the clergy in civil government, is no longer valid and admissible. I wished to demonstrate how important it is that example be afforded by the heads of the church; that they should evidence a zeal for the cause of religion; that they should be above suspicion of self-interest, ambition, or worldly gain; that they should be, in conduct as in name, successors of the apostles. The ministry of the word afforded sufficient employment for the apostles, and so it would for their successors; for who can believe, looking to the extent of jurisdiction given to bishops in this country, that sufficient employment for their time may not be found within their respective dioceses? I ask you to consider with what grace can you require the village pastor to reside amongst his flock, when the spiritual overseer, whose duty it is to watch over hundreds of parishes and hundreds of pastors, is removed far away from the scene of his duties, mixing in the contention of senates, or moving in the splendour of courts. I bid you remember that the placing of political power in the hands of those whose interested learning must ever be averse to popular government, is a practice dangerous to the liberties and welfare of the community. The church, as a spiritual community, has no concern with secular government; the establishment has property, and that being a temporality, should be represented in Parliament, but not by bishops or Christian officers, for these are servants of that lord and master whose kingdom was not of this world, who did not delegate to others a greater power than he himself received from God; they are the stewards of his mysteries, and no employment should take them from their proper business to preserve religion, the immediate purpose of which is to promote purity of worship, the ultimate one salvation of souls. I call upon all friends of religion seriously to consider this momentous truth, that men too often associate their ideas of religion with the conduct of its teachers—their respect for the one is often regulated by their respect for the other—the political conduct of the bishops in Parliament has lowered their character in the eyes of the community, and whatever tends to create irreverent ideas of religion diminishes its influence on the human mind. Let the property of the church be sufficiently represented in Parliament, but make not a high religious office the qualification for political office; take away the splendour of title, that remnant of a vicious practice, alike insulting and disgraceful to the Christian shepherd—derobe them from this political livery, and let it be seen that they accept not the oversight of the flock for filthy lucre or worldly gain, but “of a willing mind.” Let the head

of the state be supreme over all persons, civil and ecclesiastical, merely as citizens, and let no ecclesiastical ruler enjoy political power by virtue of his office. Thus the Christian prelate, turning his eyes from everything political, may rest his hopes and fears upon religion alone—may exert his undivided efforts to maintain that which alone should concern a Christian church—its purity and its usefulness. I move for leave to bring in a bill “To relieve the archbishops and bishops of the established church from their legislative and judicial duties in the House of Peers.” (Hear, hear.)

Mr. GILLON rose to second the motion of his hon. friend the member for Gateshead. He felt it to be a subject which commanded much of the public attention, and one which it behoved the Legislature to take into their earliest, their most serious consideration. He should not conceive it necessary, in support of the motion, to go back to very remote periods of history. He would at once admit that as far as ancient usage or precedent went to establish a rule, that usage was all on the adverse side of the question. In the earliest periods of our history we found the clergy taking a part in the Legislature of the kingdom, and before Parliaments existed, conferring with and advising the princes of the country, and forming a component part of the councils of the nation. This was easily accounted for in earlier ages, for besides the great power and wealth which they possessed, and the influence which superstitious men imparted to them, they were, in fact, in those early times, the only instructed portion of the community, and the power which they had thus acquired, and which was so acceptable to them, they endeavoured to continue by perpetuating the ignorance of the people. But he considered antiquity to be no plea; for that which was by experience found to be hurtful, the more cause there was to remove it. He would, however, very briefly notice two periods in our history which more immediately bore on the point now in view.

In the discussions which took place in 1611, on the bill for restraining bishops and others from intermeddling in secular affairs, the arguments of those who maintained the right of churchmen to sit in the other house of the Legislature, and of Lord Newark in particular, resolved themselves into three points—1st, the antiquity of the custom; with that he should not further interfere; 2d, that it would remove them only for a month or two from their spiritual vocations once in three years; 3d, that by diminishing the dignity it would diminish the respect paid to the church. As to the second plea, it was one which could not be brought forward in the present day. The house had been gravely told in the last session by the right hon. member for the University of Cambridge of the importance of the superintending care of the bishops to the wellbeing of the church; so much so, that it was gravely proposed to add to instead of diminishing their numbers—a proposition which he hardly expected that house would entertain. But if these functions were so essential to the well-being of the church and to the advancement of religion—the main end, as he ventured to think, of the institution of the order of bishops—would they not be much more efficiently discharged were those right reverend prelates released from an onerous attendance on the business of the Legislature, which must occupy more than a half of their whole time? As long as they continued members of the Legislature, it was their duty to make themselves acquainted with all matters of state policy—with all the complicated and extended subjects of legislation, a matter in itself enough to absorb the whole man. When we considered at the same time the high importance of the holy office of these reverend prelates, the deep and eternal responsibility entailed upon them, the millions of Christian souls who were to look to them for exhortation and example, instead of adding to their sacred duties the intolerable load of legislation, he was rather inclined to exclaim, “Who is sufficient for these things?” As to the third point, that by diminishing the dignity of the members of the hierarchy the respect paid to them would be at the same time diminished, he was inclined to hold that the very converse of this proposition was the fact. It was this grandeur which, separating them by a broad line of distinction from the generality of men, and calling their attention from spiritual to worldly affairs, impaired their usefulness, and caused them to be regarded rather with jealousy and suspicion than with that awe and reverence befitting the sacred nature of their office. Did the apostles of old live in gorgeous palaces? did they arrogate to themselves tem-

poral dignities (for it was as barons that the bishops held seats in the other house of the Legislature), or did they intermeddle in state affairs? No; and in all time, in proportion as churchmen had so intermeddled, in proportion as they had merged the character of teachers of the word in that of the busy intriguer and crafty politician, had they lost that respect which the conscientious minister would at all times command. These things might gain them cup and courtesy, but they lost them the consciences of men.

He could not here avoid quoting the eloquent words of that noble patriot Lord Say and Sele, whose memory he regarded with so much veneration. He said "While they kept themselves to the work of their ministry alone, and gave themselves to prayer and the ministry of the word according to the example of the apostles, the world received the greatest benefit from them; they were the light and life thereof; but when their ambition cast them down like stars from heaven to earth, and they did grow once to be advanced above their brethren, I do appeal to all who have been versed in the ancient ecclesiastical stories or modern history, whether they have not been the common incendiaries of the Christian world, never ceasing from contentions one with another about the precedence of their sees and churches, excommunicating one another, drawing princes to be parties with them, and thereby casting them into bloody wars. Their ambition and intermeddling with secular affairs and state business hath been the cause of shedding more Christian blood than anything else in the Christian world." Do not the same scenes, so strongly portrayed, disgrace the present times? Is not Ireland made a theatre of warfare and contention in order to maintain the dignity of an anti-national priesthood? Is not a peculiar creed forced on that unhappy land by the power of the sword and military violence? and is not the blood of innocent victims made an unholy offering on the altar of a God of mercy and love? He would now but allude to the discussions which took place in that house on the bill of 1801 for excluding persons in holy orders from having seats in it. It was argued by Mr. Fox and Mr. Grey that all the arguments which applied to excluding men in holy orders from that assembly, applied with equal or greater force to the right of the bishops to hold seats in the other house of the Legislature. Mr. Fox asked was it not true of the bishops who sat in the House of Lords, as of the inferior clergy, that it was their duty to devote themselves to the duties of their sacred character? He thought, as was then contended, that by that measure an act of some hardship and injustice was passed; for while he should willingly concur in excluding all endowed clergy from either house, on the broad ground that they could not efficiently discharge the duties of both offices, he was inclined to think that when a clergyman chose to separate himself from his holy calling, and to devote himself exclusively to secular affairs, it was unjust to him and to the constituency of the country, in a reformed Parliament, that he should be incapable of becoming one of their representatives. He was happy to observe that the hon. member for Cambridge intended to bring forward a bill on this subject; it should certainly have his support. Let us now look, continued the hon. member, to what has been passing amongst ourselves.

It is argued that it is fitting that the bishops should hold seats in the other house of the Legislature, in order to defend the rights and property of the church. Has their interference been confined, I will ask, to ecclesiastical subjects? Has their intermeddling in state affairs been of that modest nature pointed out by the Bishop of Lincoln? Have they not taken an active part in all those intrigues and cabals, which will render the present times the most famous (he would not use a stronger expression) in history? Have they not so mixed themselves up with the factions and combinations in this and the last Parliament, in all which they have been engaged more or less, that they seemed not to content themselves with encroachments upon our spiritual privileges, but have envied us our civil freedom? He agreed with the rev. churchman who had thus eloquently written:—"If it be admitted that the value of any public station, considered in its own abstract effect, or as it bears on, and is necessarily connected with, the general interests of society, be commensurate with its utility, it follows, that every privilege or occupation of the person holding such station should have an affinity to the essential qualities of his office, and the objects for which it was constituted. If this be admitted, my lord, what connexion of a useful or moral kind has a stormy

midnight debate in the House of Lords with the peaceful tenour of life and manners which become an ecclesiastic? Whilst such a temple as the House of Lords is open for the entrance of spiritual men, and such ladders of ambition as from Llandaff to Canterbury, and from Ossory to Armagh, pride will hold its dominion, and exercise it, over the hearts of men. If a precedent be wanting for the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords, behold it in the exclusion of all the peerage of Ireland, except of the twenty-eight representatives. And let it be recollected that their right was hereditary. It is most weakly argued, that the bishops represent the church, and refrain from every debate, unless where the interests of that church are concerned. This, we well know, is not always the case; and it is objected that they can vote on all occasions. Where the affairs of the church require the assistance and sanction of Parliament, can it be doubted that they would be received with respect, and treated with favour, by that Parliament, upon a formal representation of the bishops, rather than by a Parliament perhaps exasperated by the opposition or advocacy, no matter which, of spiritual men, of some public measure, which had been the subject of debate amongst men of the first-rate talents, with their passions excited by a contest for victory? When I use these arguments, I mean no invidious application; the moral, I again say, grows out of the obliquity of human affairs. I verily believe that there are many bishops of sanctified hearts, single-minded, and of just conduct. Yet do I think that all such should be far removed from suspicion; and that vanity and arrogance would be imputed to them, were they animated by the zeal of St. Paul, and adorned with the simplicity of the disciple whom Jesus loved, and on whose gentle bosom he leaned." The pride, pomp, and circumstance of worldly grandeur befitted not the followers of a humble and lowly master; a heated and angry debate in the House of Lords accorded but ill with the meekness and charity which should distinguish a Christian minister. The arena of political disputation was no place for the presence of a messenger of peace. He would remove those right rev. prelates from a scene so unbefitting their presence—from the frivolities of a court and the temptations of a capital, and would enable them, by devoting themselves to the duties of their sacred calling, by the preaching and the practice of Christian charity, to make themselves truly respected and beloved. One point more he would allude to, and he had done. What justice was there that there should be in one house of the Legislature the representatives of one church and one sect alone? Why were they to be more favoured than the established church of Scotland? or than the tens of thousands, the millions, who, in every part of the empire, conform not to the favoured creed? The house might undervalue this argument,—the country would duly prize it, and would see in the presence of those rev. prelates in the upper house a barrier to their acquiring their just rights and privileges. What course His Majesty's Ministers might adopt in regard to this motion he knew not, but it was but too easy to guess. The measure being carried which they had looked to as a means to annihilate their political rivals, formerly in power, their motto seemed now to be, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no further." No one measure of efficient and satisfactory reform had met with their concurrence. The church and the aristocracy were taken under their especial protection, while the people, on whose shoulders they were carried into power, were forgotten. But the great tide of truth and justice will roll on, fertilizing as it flows, and will obliterate even the vestige of the paltry expedients by which temporizing politicians would seek to stop its majestic course. (Hear.)

The moment that Mr. Gillon sat down, the Tories, who had clustered thickly on the left of the Speaker's chair, began to vociferate "Question, question;" thus attempting to force on a division without any discussion at all; the object being, no doubt, to throw contempt on the motion and its supporters. Cries of "Divide, divide," followed those of "Question" from the same quarter; and then succeeded calls for "Lord Althorp, Lord Althorp," from the same compact and united band.

Lord Althorp at length rose, and, smiling on the quarter from

whence these calls proceeded, he said—"If he could really persuade himself that there were any number of gentlemen in the House who would give their support to the motion now before them, or if he thought it was seriously meant to be carried to a division, he might, perhaps, think it necessary to make some reply.\* But feeling assured that the House neither wished nor expected it, he should not trespass on their patience by offering any observations on the subject." After which, again interchanging smiles with his opposite encouragers in this contemptuous course, he resumed his seat. We have been the more particular in stating these circumstances, because we perceive in the *Times*, in which the verbatim report of Mr. Rippon's speech is given, a statement in these words—

LORD ALTHORP rose amidst loud and general calls of "Question" from several parts of the house. The noble lord having made *several attempts to obtain a hearing*, amidst reiterated cries of "Question," stated, that if *honourable members* did not think it *necessary* he should not trespass on their patience by offering any reply. (Loud cheers.) The noble lord was understood to meet the proposition by a direct negative.

Now, the cries proceeded from only *one* part of the House, and that the Tory benches, which were chiefly filled with the younger members, Sir Robert Peel and those who sat on the lower bench taking no part in these clamorous proceedings. The noble lord did not make *several* attempts to obtain a hearing, but was heard, as he always is, with attention from the moment he rose; and the reason he assigned for not replying to the speeches of the mover and seconder was, *not* the opposition of those who cried "Question," but his conviction that no number of persons could be found in the House who would seriously support the motion in question; which gives an entirely different complexion to the whole affair.

Sir WILLIAM INGILBY thought that the noble lord would have acted more wisely to have allowed some discussion on the subject. (Cries from the Tories of "Question, question.") He believed that the great increase of Dissenters was mainly attributable to the offensive conduct of the higher orders of the Church. (Cries from the same quarter, "Divide, divide.")

Mr. TENNYSON was still more violently interrupted than Sir William Ingilby when he began, because it was thought he was going to support the proposition. But the moment he said he should oppose the motion, the clamour ceased, and he went on. His argument against the proposition was, that as the Reform of the Church would soon be entered on, the Bishops ought to be continued in the House of Lords until the measures of reform were completed.

Mr. HUGHES HUGHES was as much misrepresented in the newspapers as Lord Althorp; for he is made to express his blame of Ministers, and his concurrence in the motion; whereas he did the very reverse. He commended the Ministers for the summary way in which they treated the question, and strongly opposed the motion.

Mr. JAMES said that the conduct of the Government in this matter persuaded him that they had no satisfactory answer to give; and their own conduct induced him to give his support to the proposition before the House.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM said, the observations with which he should venture to trouble the house on this occasion, would be very few and very short. Indeed, after the manner in which the noble lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had met this motion, and the attempts that had been made to stifle all discussion on this subject, it required no small degree of confidence to present himself to the house at all. That confidence, however, he derived from the strength of his convictions, as to the justice of the cause, and on this ground alone did he rise to express his entire concurrence in the proposition of the hon. mover. (Hear, hear.)

It appeared to him that there were usually three tests by which all measures introduced into this house were judged;—the first was, whether the public at large felt strongly on the subject, and expressed those feelings in any marked manner:—the second was, whether there were any vested rights or large pecuniary interests at stake:—and the third was, whether, supposing the measure to be completed, any public satisfaction could be given, or any public good be produced. Now, judging the present question by each of these tests, he felt persuaded that it ought to be seriously entertained and seriously met, and therefore he could not but regret the manner in which it had been treated as of no public importance whatever. (Hear, hear.) As to the first, the noble lord, and those who formed his colleagues in the cabinet, might believe that the community at large took no interest in the matter. But in this he would take the liberty to assure them that they were entirely mistaken. Mingling as they did, only with persons of their own rank and class, they had not the same opportunity that humbler individuals possessed of knowing the feelings and sentiments of the great bulk of the people. But, as far as his experience might qualify him to pronounce an opinion on this subject, he could assure the noble lord that in every part of England that he had yet visited, he had found the majority of the intelligent part of the population strongly in favour of the measure proposed. (Hear, hear.) It must be evident that the entire mass of the Catholic population, and the whole of the Dissenters, must desire its accomplishment on principle: since the sitting of the Bishops in the House of Lords was one of the great marks of the dominant supremacy of the State Church, and the exclusion of the heads of every other sect was a badge of their inferiority. But if there should be added to all these a large number of the most pious and devout communicants of the church itself, who desire to see the establishment purified of those temporal, and secular, and political appendages, which in their estimation impeded and obstructed its religious utility, and who thought the bishops would be more spiritually employed in attending to the care of their respective dioceses—(cheers)—if all these were taken into account, they would no doubt form a numerical majority of the whole population of the kingdom. Judging the measure then by this first test, it ought, undoubtedly, to be entertained. As to the second, there were no vested rights or large pecuniary interests at stake, that need make the house pause in entertaining it, as no proposition was now made for abating the incomes of the Bishops, or interfering in any way with their revenues; but simply to relieve them of those political duties, which, as bishops, they could not adequately or usefully fulfil, without a neglect of those more appropriate and more important religious duties which they had solemnly undertaken to perform. (Hear, hear.) The last test, that of the affording public satisfaction, and accomplishing public good by the passing of the measure, was one, by which the question could only be judged of, through discussion; and this it appeared that his Majesty's Ministers were either unable or unwilling to afford it. He believed, however, that notwithstanding this attempt to stifle and suppress the debate, the noble lord would find that he had greatly underrated the numbers of those who would support this measure, within the house as well as without; and he therefore begged to express his earnest hope that the honorable mover would not withdraw his motion, but press it to a division, in order that it might be seen whether or not the proposition was approved and by whom—when, he had no doubt, though they might form but a minority, it would still be not so small as the noble lord evidently anticipated, when he assigned, as a reason for not replying to the question, his belief that no number of persons in the house would be found to support the motion before them. (Cheers.)

Mr. O'REILLY, in explanation of the vote he meant to give, considered that, as a Catholic member, he was bound to abstain from taking any part in a question relating purely to the Protestant religion.

Mr. O'CONNELL contended that the question was not a religious but purely a political one. It did not seek to interfere with any question of theology, nor with any spiritual functions of the prelates of the Protestant church, but was merely whether it would be advantageous to the public interests that they should sit as legislators in the House of Lords or not. He should therefore give the motion his hearty support.

Mr. D. W. HARVEY said that it had often been repeated in that house that every order of society was fairly represented in that assembly, and that there was no feeling entertained by any rational class of the community which could not find expression within it. Owing, as he did, his seat to the kind and disinterested exertions of a large portion of persons known as Protestant Dissenters, and never shrinking from the unprofitable avowal of a full participation in their sentiments, he felt, on this trying occasion, that he should be abandoning their cause, and disappointing their just expectations, if he were to permit this motion to be smothered in the manner in which His Majesty's Government were now endeavouring to smother it. (Hear.) It was true that it was not his intention to enter into this subject at present, as he had once proposed, and as he was prepared to do, both by inquiry and by conviction, because it would seem that this high compliment was to be paid to the advocates of this motion, namely, that all attempts to defend the continuance of the possession of seats in Parliament by the spiritual bishops should be abandoned by His Majesty's Government in that house. ("Hear," and a laugh.) It was said that this motion was undeserving of support, or indeed of discussion, because it was not connected with the consideration of whether tithes was a tax or not,—because it did not involve any such momentous inquiry as whether farmers should ride to market in gigs without springs or not. (A laugh.) Inasmuch as it was not a question of that minor kind, no one was to speak on it without being exposed to the risk of contumely and reproach. He was ready to take his full share of that contumely and of that reproach, because, however unpalatable the subject might now be to the house, there was no subject which interested so deeply the feelings of the people of England, no cause which was advancing so rapidly to success, as that now under the consideration of Parliament. There was a cause at work, which at no very distant period would render it necessary for the house to discuss this question, not whether it should continue the bishops in possession of their seats in the House of Lords, but whether it should maintain a church establishment at all. At present there was a concessory and conciliatory spirit animating the Dissenters, and whenever he had heard it said that the Dissenters wished to seize upon the revenues of the church, he had denounced it as a foul and false calumny upon their principles and feelings. (Hear, hear.) This, however, he must be permitted to say, with regard to the question of separating the church from the state, that if the Dissenters could not effect it by the fair and legitimate means of free and open discussion, they must effect it by those other means of influence which appealed more powerfully to the interests of mankind. (Hear, hear.) The church of England would fall when it ceased to have revenues, and therein consisted its worldly character. (Hear, hear.) Non. members were too much in the habit of confounding the interests with the doctrines of the church of England in their advocacy of the establishment. Tithes and theology, dogmas and divinity, were not the same things, but very different. The church of England, as displayed in its doctrines and principles, was dear to a great portion of the people of England, whether belonging to that church or remaining out of its pale. (Hear, hear.) But its doctrines and its principles were essentially different from its institutions as established by law. If you were to disrobe the church of its gorgeous array, if you were to deprive the bishops of their temporal baronies, the church of England would not merely stand, but would flourish in increased prosperity. (Cheers.) You would see in its principles its purity, in its professions its articles of faith. Nothing, however, had so great a tendency to throw suspicion around its professions,—nothing had so great a tendency to disparage its principles, which were imperishable, and proclaimed from Sinai,—as the glaring fact of bishops belying the simplicity of their creed by the gorgeousness of their worldly appearance. (Hear, hear.) Nothing armed infidelity with its most powerful weapons but the gorgeousness of the episcopacy. (Hear, hear.) There was no reciprocity between the splendid appearance of the dignitaries of the church of England and the lowly genius of the religion which they professed. (Hear, hear.) There was therefore no mode so well calculated to restore the bishops to the estimation in which they ought to be held by the people as that which would relieve them from their seats in the House of Lords, and would send

them to scenes of rural simplicity to exercise the functions of their divine calling. (Hear, hear.)

He was sorry to say that many things had been advanced in the course of that evening's discussion which by the dexterity of debate might have been turned against the present motion. It could not be imputed to those who had advocated the proposition of his hon. friend that they had shown too much concord in their views. (A laugh.) One of his hon. friends had not objected to a certain number of bishops retaining their seats in the House of Lords, he had only objected to there being so many. Now, if there were to be any bishops in the House of Lords, the number was to him a matter of complete indifference. (Hear, hear.) He had advocated that point in the discussions upon the Church of Ireland Temporalities Bill. He admitted that in the degree in which religion was to be advanced through the agency of episcopacy, in that degree it was of importance that its establishment should be perfect. (Hear, hear.) That which he quarrelled with, that which the Protestant Dissenters objected to, was the alliance of the church and the state for the defence of the exclusive temporalities of the former. When it was said that the church of England ought not to have its bishops seated in Parliament, because other sects had not preachers there, was it meant to be insinuated that representatives of the other sects—a species of Dissenting bishops—were wanted in the House of Lords? To attribute such a notion to the Nonconformists was a gross libel upon them, as gross a libel as to attribute to them any wish to divide the resources and revenues of the church. They wished to have no connexion with the state, either as regarded the church or as regarded its revenues. (Hear.) They were of opinion—an opinion confirmed by the experience of 1,800 years—that Christianity required no aid from the civil power (cheers), and that it was impeded in its progress whenever such aid was tendered to it. (Cheers continued.) During the three first centuries of the Christian era, it was able to stand and triumph over powers far more formidable than any of those which sprung out of the refinements of the present age. It overcame the power of paganism and humbled the pride of the Cæsars. There was nothing in the pomp of Rome or the pride of courts which could resist its divine but simple dignity. However powerful the fashion of the present times might be,—however profitable the subserviency of courts,—however brilliant the regalia of monarchy,—whatever splendour might belong to crowns, or sanctity to mitres,—whatever strength there might be in sceptres, or whatever reverence in crosses, Christianity rested on imperishable principles, and all that the Nonconformists asked was to let Christianity stand on its own inherent and imperishable principles. (Loud cheering.)

Mr. HUME was sorry that he had not been present at the commencement of this debate, but he could not permit it to conclude without repeating within it the sentiments which he had often expressed elsewhere upon this subject. He considered the present establishment of bishops in every respect indefensible—bishops, to promote the interest of religion, should never be placed in situations where they might be called upon to act in opposition to the feelings of the people. He had no hesitation in saying that after their proceedings on the Reform Bill, the bishops had rendered themselves odious in the opinion of the people of England. (Hear, hear.) He admitted that having seats in the other House of Parliament, they had a right to give their votes as they pleased; but their exercise of that right had led the people of England to this conclusion—that to render them beloved by their flocks they should be deprived of the power which brought them into collision with the people. (Hear, hear.) He was sure that in the opinion of at least three-fourths of the people of England there was no difference on this subject. The motion, so far from deserving to be treated as one not worthy of discussion, was, in point of fact, perfectly irresistible. (Cheers.) Ministers, therefore, acted wisely in saying nothing against it. (Hear, hear.) He hoped that they felt with him that political power was never mixed up advantageously with religious functions. (Hear, hear.) It was no defence of the bishops' seats in Parliament to tell him that they had been held for centuries, for he had no regard for any thing ancient unless it was also useful. (Hear, hear.) Consider-



ing the junction of political power with religious functions to be quite incompatible, he had great pleasure in giving his support to the present motion.

Mr. SUELL rose to express his own opinion upon this motion rather than to invite Ministers, for such invitation he knew would be in vain, to express their sentiments upon it. He also rose because he thought that it would be pusillanimous on his part as an individual not to record his opinions on a question so generally interesting. He could not help thinking that a large change of opinion with respect to the bishops had taken place in the Ministry since no very remote period. Did not hon. members recollect the menace uttered against them in another place, when they were significantly warned to "set their houses in order?" (Cheers from the Tory benches.) The times, however, were changed, and His Majesty's Ministers now felt retrospective indignation for the indignities which these rev. personages formerly suffered. (Cheers.) It appeared as if a declaration was now wanted from the house that this question was not worthy of discussion. (Hear, hear.) Now, he implored the house to recollect what had been done on the bill, not for the reform of the church of Ireland, for there was no church of Ireland, but for the reform of the united churches of England and Ireland. If they had made so scruple to sacrifice 12 Irish bishops, why was it to be deemed sacriligious to propose the reduction of some little incidents attached to the dignities of the English bishops? (Hear.) It must be manifest to any man who reflected on the proceedings which occurred shortly before the carrying of the Reform Bill, that it would have been much better had the bishops never interfered against it. (Cheers.) It was said that no such thing would ever occur again; but what security could the public have of that? He wished Ministers would attend more regularly at the morning sittings, for they would then hear the petitions of the Dissenters, in which were contained propositions much more alarming and much more inimical to the existing establishments than the present motion. Those petitioners represented the opinions of 9,000,000 of persons in the two islands. (Hear.) It had been said that the heads of the church ought always to be in Parliament, but his answer to that assertion was, "Look at the church of Scotland, built on the rock of poverty, and unadorned by dignity and wealth." He was convinced that for any loss of power which the bishops might sustain in consequence of being deprived of their seats, they would find more than ample compensation in the increased confidence and gratitude of the people. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. EWART said that he agreed with the hon. member for Tipperary that the independent members of the house should not be deterred into a pusillanimous silence on this occasion. It might be well for His Majesty's Government to maintain a mysterious reserve; in them such a course might be prudent, it might be expedient. But he (Mr. Ewart) held that the independent members of the house were justified in acting on more general principles, and of taking a long-sighted view on important questions such as this. They must consider what in the main, and with a comprehensive view of the future, was the wisest and most reasonable course. He entertained the conscientious opinion (and entertaining it he was bound to express it) that it would be better for the interests of the church—it would be better for the cause of religion—it would be better for the permanent good of the state—that the bishops should not mingle political with religious duties. With this brief declaration of his reasons for supporting the motion he should at present be content. But he felt that he could not, with self-satisfaction, have given a silent vote on this occasion.

The House becoming impatient, and no one attempting to rise to say a single word on behalf of the Bishops, Mr. Rippon had no matter to reply to; and the cries of "Divide, divide," being incessant, a division took place, when the numbers were—For the motion, 58; Against it, 125. As this division was much larger than the Ministers or the Tories expected, their surprise as well as vexation was manifested by their countenances; and this was heightened by the minority receiving the announcement of the numbers with loud cheers. We shall return to this subject again.

## DEBATE ON THE PUNISHMENT OF FLOGGING IN THE ARMY.

THE debate on this question—so interesting to the friends of humanity, as well as to the advocates of civilized penalties being applied to civilized beings, instead of continuing the savage tortures suited only to savage men—was brought on on Friday evening, when the Report of the Mutiny Bill was brought up. Having ourselves taken part in the debate, we do not wish to prejudice the question by any preliminary observations, but will pass on to the report of the debate itself, giving, as we are bound to do, the fullest report of the speech of the gallant officer who opened the debate, and stating, as clearly as we can, the general substance of the rest.

Major FANCOURT rose to bring forward the motion of which he had given notice, on this subject. He said, that in submitting to the house some of the considerations which induced him to move a clause for the abolition of military flogging, he was anxious that the motives by which he had been induced to come forward should not be misunderstood. He could assure the house, that if any hon. gentleman, whether connected with the Ministers or not, had evinced a disposition to undertake the question with a view to its final settlement, he should have been content to give a silent vote for the abolition of military flogging; but when on a late occasion he saw the hon. member for Sheffield abandon his motion on what (to him at least) appeared a somewhat vague and unsatisfactory promise from the right hon. gentleman opposite, he thought it is duty to give notice of a motion on the subject, and for this reason—that whether the punishment of flogging was necessary for the preservation of military discipline or not, it was of great importance that the question should be fairly met and disposed of by a definite expression of the views of Parliament. The discussion of such a question year after year, in almost the selfsame terms, and meeting it by a promise of gradually diminishing a practice which, if indefensible, should be abolished at once, was not a course calculated to lend dignity to any deliberative assembly. He therefore indulged a hope, that whatever resolution the house might adopt on the present occasion, one advantage at least would be gained,—namely, that the country would be enabled to judge from the votes of its representatives in Parliament whether the degrading practice in question was likely to be discontinued. Certain it was that its discontinuance might now be most naturally demanded; for, without enumerating the long list of distinguished persons who had so often and so eloquently denounced this practice, he might observe of the present Government generally, that looking at the reiterated professions of its members and the avowed character of its policy, the country had a right to expect something more definite than the order lately issued from the Horse-Guards. In the humane and enlightened views of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Ellice) he felt disposed to place full confidence, but if the practice complained of was, as he contended it was, a national disgrace, its continuance could hardly be contended for on the ground that the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues were anxious to abolish it. (Hear, hear.) Before proceeding to a more close consideration of the arguments urged in support of military flogging, he would just say a word on the order lately issued from the Horse-Guards, in compliance with a pledge given to that

effect by the right hon. gentleman. The order was very short, and with permission of the house he would read it.

"His Majesty's Government having signified to the General Commanding-in-Chief the King's command, that until further orders corporal punishments may be applied to the following offences only, I have the honour to express Lord Hill's desire that you guide yourself accordingly, taking care that, except in the instances herein specified, the said punishment shall on no account be inflicted:—1st. For mutiny, insubordination, and violence, or using or offering violence to superior officers. 2d. Drunkenness on duty. 3d. Sale of, or making away with arms, ammunition, accoutrements, or necessities, stealing from comrades, or other disgraceful conduct. It will doubtless occur to you that the object of these instructions is not to render the infliction of corporal punishment for the future more frequent or more certain than it is at present, even in the cases in which it is now to be restricted; but, on the contrary, that the intention is to restrain it as much as may be possible to do so with safety to the discipline of the army."

Now it really appeared to him that this order left the matter much in the same state as that in which it originally stood. (Hear.) It was true that they got rid of flogging for desertion; but a more comprehensive term than "insubordination and other disgraceful conduct" could hardly have been selected. The offences enumerated in the Mutiny Act under this latter head he would read to the house. (The hon. gentleman here read some extracts from the Mutiny Act.) It appeared to him that an officer disposed to undue severity would find nothing in this order to restrain him. Some gentlemen might be disposed to ask if it was probable that officers would act in a manner at variance with the spirit of the order? That was a question which he did not feel called on to answer. He was to judge of the spirit of the order by the manifest import of its wording, and this was, he would contend, of a nature to admit of almost any abuse of authority on the part of a superior officer. Far be it from him to accuse officers generally of a disposition to abuse their authority; but his object was to place the soldier beyond the reach of any such abuse, and towards the attainment of that object the order lately issued from the Horse-Guards was, in his opinion, of no assistance whatever. But let them examine the actual working of the present system, and what advantage resulted from the possession of that power which it was sought to abolish. In the first place, he was anxious to point out one very important error into which many hon. gentlemen had fallen. They entertained an opinion that it would be inexpedient and dangerous to deprive courts-martial of a power, by the possession of which alone they could hope to deter the ill-disposed from the commission of extreme offences. Now, in point of fact, these were the very offences which were not visited by the lash. Flogging, as at present inflicted, might be termed a punishment for such offences as were tried by district or regimental courts-martial, which were the tribunals for lesser offences. District courts-martial were limited to the infliction of 300 lashes, and regimental to 200 lashes. General courts-martial, on the contrary, before which the graver offences were tried, might inflict any number of lashes, but as they were no longer permitted to bring a culprit up a second time for the purpose of receiving that portion of the punishment which, from exhaustion, he might be unable to undergo, general courts-martial, for the most part, passed sentence of transportation or imprisonment, as being a punishment more commensurate to the crime than the infliction of the number of lashes which, ordinarily speaking, the prisoner was able to bear. Thus the practice in question was brought into operation precisely in those cases where it was least called for, while the most flagrant violations of military duty were differently treated.

But in refutation that the fear that the lash was necessary to keep the soldier to his duty, he would observe on a very important fact, which had singularly enough been passed over in all previous discussions of this question; it was, that in the Horse-Guards the punishment of flogging could hardly be said to exist, for a man, if flogged, was usually expelled the regiment. Were they not to infer from this, that the punishment of flogging was in those regiments regarded in so disgraceful a light, that a man once flogged was for ever degraded in the eyes of his fellow-soldiers? (Hear, hear.) He might perhaps be told that a superior class of men

enlisted in the Life Guards. (Hear, hear.) That great inquiries were made as to the characters of men wishful to enlist, he was aware; but he questioned much whether men able to stand the test of such inquiry would join the regiment but from the very fact that they could not be subjected to the lash for any offences (hear, hear), save those which rendered them unworthy to remain in that regiment, and this he conceived to be a strong proof of the debasing nature of corporal punishment. He would not detain the house by any description of the barbarity of this punishment, or of the brutalizing influence which it must have on the minds of those subjected to it; on those points all he believed were well agreed: then surely it was the solemn duty of Parliament to inquire whether some efficient substitute might be provided for a class of punishments liable to such grave objections. For his own part, he was convinced that such a substitute might be furnished in solitary confinement. That this latter would be the more efficient punishment for the reclamation of offenders he was justified in believing from the result of many and anxious inquiries, and also from what had fallen under his own observation with respect to the effect of the punishment in regiments in India. He remembered one instance in particular, of a man in a regiment in India, in which he (Major Fancourt) had the honour to serve. He was sentenced to 300 lashes, and the commanding officer told him that he might escape the infliction of the corporal punishment if he would submit to three weeks' solitary confinement. The man said he would rather undergo the lashes. He was aware it was unusual to give such an option; indeed the practice was subsequently repressed by Lord Hastings, the then commander-in-chief, and he merely mentioned the fact as illustrative of the horror with which the soldier contemplated the punishment of solitary confinement. It might, perhaps, be said that this case went to prove the small degree of apprehension with which the soldier regarded the infliction of the lash, but he begged further to add that the man in question was an old offender, and in this case, as in almost every other, it might be confidently asserted that a man once subject to the lash, so far from being reclaimed, became a hardened and incorrigible offender. (Hear.) At present the punishment of solitary confinement in the hands of regimental courts-martial was limited to twenty days; if substituted for the lash, it might be extended in duration, and accompanied with circumstances of severity with reference to diet and the rest, as the court-martial should adjudge. As to the objection to solitary confinement on the score of the expense of building cells, surely the consideration of expense would not be urged, when they were called upon to put an end to a national disgrace. (Hear, hear.)

But some hon. members might say, why interfere with the punishment now, when, by universal acknowledgement, year after year, the lash was falling gradually into disuse? This argument, if good for anything, was, he thought, favourable to the abolition of the punishment; for why preserve to courts-martial a power the exercise of which was yearly decreasing? Unless necessary for practical purposes, why should the soldier labour under the degrading consciousness of its existence? If the army, by the progressive improvement of its men, or by the more temperate and judicious decisions of its court, could dispense with the odious practice, was not that an additional reason for consulting the national feeling, which justly revolted at the subjecting a British soldier to the lash? He for one thought so; and when hon. gentlemen talked of the yearly decrease of the punishment, he found in their argument an additional reason for its total and final abolition. But to return to the question of the substitute; if by this term was meant the substitution of one system of savage torture for another, then he would at once confess that he had no substitute to propose; but that a class of punishments fully adequate for the enforcement of military duty, and at the same time offering no outrage to humanity or natural feeling, might be adopted, he was fully convinced. The house was not probably aware that there always existed in the army a class of secondary punishments, which, in addition to the solitary confinement of which he had already spoken, would, he thought, leave little to be desired in this respect. Such were the forfeiting of all advantages as to additional pay or to pension on discharge, confinement to barracks, extra duties, and other punishments of a like nature,—all be it observed, exceedingly vexatious to the

offender, while they excited none of that commiseration in the minds of his fellow-soldiers which was caused by the infliction of the lash. To these he might add what he thought would be an equally just and efficient punishment—namely, the withholding the soldier's daily pay on every occasion on which the regiment was deprived of his services, either by drunkenness or misconduct, on such occasions putting him for the time on prisoners' diet. In the instance of an incorrigible offender, he could not but think that expulsion with ignominy from the army would be the preferable course in every point of view. If it was true that flogging seldom if ever reclaimed a man; nay, that on the contrary, it caused a reckless abandonment of character, so that the soldier once subjected to the punishment became comparatively hardened to it, and consequently to the offences by which it was incurred—if this were true, then what possible advantage could be gained either by the infliction of the punishment in the first instance, or by retaining such a person in the regiment at all? Granting that his pernicious influence should be productive of no contaminating effects, a supposition scarcely possible, still he contended that a well conducted body of men had just cause of complaint of one or more incorrigible offenders, notorious for disregard of duty, were suffered to remain among them. The self-respect of the soldier must necessarily be lowered by such a course. But how different would be the result were ignominious expulsion adopted as the extreme punishment. Not only would the regiment be rid of an incorrigible offender, but his comrades would be made to feel that an obstinate adherence to unsoldierlike and disgraceful conduct rendered a man unworthy of remaining one of their body. The moral effect of such a course was, he thought, self-evident. But some lion members would say, this is beginning at the wrong end; you must first persuade a superior class of men to enlist before you can bring the soldier to this lofty sense of his duty. With great submission, he (Major Fancourt) thought that they never would be able to recruit their army from a class of men superior to the present until they removed the disgraceful badge now distinguishing the soldier from the citizen—namely, his liability to the lash; and he further ventured to affirm, that this humane and necessary step once taken, they would find respectable persons in the working and middle classes not only willing but anxious to embrace a profession presenting many advantages. There was only one more point connected with this question with which he thought it necessary to trouble the house.

Many gentlemen, officers of the army and others, though favourable to the principle of abolishing the practice of flogging, seemed to consider the power of inflicting it as necessary during active service or during the line of march. Now what was the fact? A man flogged under such circumstances was necessarily disabled for a considerable time—he was laid on the hospital carts an object of sympathy rather than a salutary example to his fellow-soldiers. The course adopted by the French army was, he thought, much more efficient. The offender was ordered to the rear, treated as a prisoner, handcuffed during the day's march, and at night confined in the gaol of the town at which the regiment halted, till at the end of the journey he was formally tried and sentenced to such further punishment as the nature of his offence might demand. It might, perhaps, be urged that offenders would regard such a punishment with indifference—that, in fact, it would be matter of indifference to them if they were ordered to the rear or not. This argument might apply were their being so ordered, the full amount of their punishment; but it was to be remembered that, in addition to being cut off from all communication with their fellow-soldiers during the day, and confined in gaols at night, they had before them the certainty of trial and the probability of severe punishment at the end of the march; so that the period looked forward to by others as one of comparative relaxation presented to the mind of the delinquent but the fear of rigid investigation and such further punishment as the nature of the offence might demand. (Hear.) By this means also, while undergoing his punishment, the man's efficiency was unimpaired, a point not unworthy of remark while considering the case of a soldier on active service. As the experience of officers might be quoted, he begged, in corroboration of the view which he had taken of this subject, to allude to some very striking observations in a work published by Lieutenant Shipp, of the 87th Regiment. He was not about

to allude to any case of cruelty, but he thought that even those who were unacquainted with this officer's distinguished services in India would hardly question his experience when they were informed that he raised himself from the rank of a private soldier to that of a commissioned officer. In the course of that gentleman's remarks on the practice of military flogging he quoted ten instances as having, out of many others, claimed his particular notice. In four out of these cases the punishment of flogging was followed by habitual drunkenness and abandonment, till a premature death closed the offender's career. In five out of the remaining six cases the soldierlike character and general efficiency of the soldier were utterly destroyed; while in one instance, and one only, the man was reclaimed; but how was he reclaimed? By the lash? No; but by a few words of kind remonstrance from his colonel (hear, hear,)—by an unconditional remission of his sentence after he had been tied up to receive it, and by a promise that if by his future conduct he should deserve promotion, it was open to him. This man had been flogged into obduracy; but even in that stage of demoralization he was subdued by a change of treatment from his superiors; and it was added, that under such treatment he became an exemplary soldier, and deserved and obtained promotion. (Hear, hear.)

Now he really thought that if the experience of officers was to guide them on matters of that nature, the testimony of one who, like Lieutenant Shipp, had seen 34 years' of active service, passing, as he himself said, through the several gradations from the drum-boy upwards, should receive attentive consideration. The hon. gentleman here read the following extract from the memoirs of Mr. Shipp:—"I am fully persuaded, from my long experience, that flogging will never urge men to reformation; for I have ever observed that it causes increased disobedience and discontent, and at last drives them to acts of sad desperation. Some of the vehement advocates for the cat also argue (but I think fallaciously) that the minds of common soldiers are, from their early habits of life, barren and uncultivated, and hence more callous, and not so susceptible of the tenderer and nicer feelings as those of the more enlightened. This is not quite so obvious to me, who have lived with them both boy and man. I would ask those who are enemies to the abolition of corporal punishment a few simple questions. Have they served in the ranks, and mixed and lived in social friendship with the private soldiers of our country? Have they ever sat at the bedside of a flogged man and witnessed the agony of his heart and the distraction of his mind? Have they ever heard the unintimidated and unbiassed opinions of the soldiers in their barrack-rooms respecting the ignominious lash? If not, they are but half competent judges on this great question." He had thought it right to submit these few considerations to the house. In so doing, it had been his object to compress within the shortest possible compass any arguments or suggestions that appeared conclusive to his own mind, for he was well aware that the subject had been frequently before the house, and also that many hon. and gallant members were qualified by long experience to propose the most efficient remedies, should the voice of Parliament pronounce the present practice a decided evil. That it was so he, for one, was fully convinced, and he trusted that all those who shared that opinion with him would honour its expression with their support; by so doing they would consult the feelings of a large majority of their fellow-subjects, not less than the honour and true interests of the army itself; nor, in his opinion, would such a course be productive of any embarrassment to His Majesty's Government. It was true that in the opinion of the country the practice of flogging ought long since to have become obsolete; but he hoped the house would not regard this subject with the narrow views of professional prejudice, or as one at all invested with party feeling. (Hear, hear.) However happy he should feel in seeing it intrusted to able and influential hands, still he could not but regard such a question as something more than a Ministerial one. It was, he conceived, a national question, and he trusted it would be entertained and disposed of in that light only, and not with reference to the narrow views of professional prejudices or party predilections. He should now conclude with moving the resolution—"That from and after the passing of this act the punishment of flogging should be entirely abolished in the British army."

## FLOGGING IN THE ARMY.

Mr. J. B. CHICHESTER said that he rose with infinite satisfaction to second the motion of his hon. and gallant colleague, whose able and collected manner in submitting this important question again to the consideration of the Legislature left but little for him (Mr. Chichester) to say to induce the house to accede to the motion of his hon. and gallant colleague. He was convinced that the abolition of the punishment of flogging would be equally pleasing and satisfactory to the country, and he hoped that the Government would not hesitate liberally to acquiesce in the feeling so generally and enthusiastically expressed. In justice to that feeling, so much in accordance with his own, he (Mr. Chichester) most cordially supported the motion of his hon. and gallant colleague.

The SPEAKER having put the question that the clause proposed be brought up,

Mr. R. GRANT rose and said that he could not but congratulate the hon. and gallant member who had brought forward the present motion upon the great temper, moderation, and conciliatory spirit with which he had submitted it to the house. He thought it necessary, standing officially as he did in the house, to call its attention to the true position in which the important subject now under its consideration really stood, because he thought that the hon. and gallant mover of the proposition now submitted to the house had been guilty of an oversight in this respect. He could not but presume that if the hon. and gallant member had recollected all that had transpired when the subject was brought under the consideration of the house by the hon. member for Sheffield, the hon. and gallant member would have been better content with the assurance that was then made by his (Mr. R. Grant's) right hon. friend, and with the course pursued by the hon. member for Sheffield upon that occasion; because he, (Mr. Grant) conceived that all parties then came to that sort of understanding that the question should be treated as an open question. He must recall the attention of the house to the circumstances, which were these:—When the Mutiny Bill was brought forward last session, a motion was submitted to the house, not for the abolition at once of the punishment of flogging, but to confine its abolition within the united kingdom. This proposition had met the approbation of many hon. members, whilst, on the other hand, it had been contended with great force that it would be most impolitic to adopt one system of military government in this country and another system still more degrading upon those employed in a more dangerous and patriotic service. On this suggestion a proposition had been made by the then right hon. member for Westminster not to try the experiment locally, but to allocate corporal punishment in three cases or classes of crime—namely, mutiny, drunkenness when on duty, and theft. On that occasion the house divided, and the minority was so large that Government took the subject into most serious consideration, and after several discussions by the Government, the result was that his right hon. friend had pledged himself to the Legislature that the Government intended to adopt that system of restriction as to corporal punishment which had been required by almost a majority of the house. He was willing to grant that some weeks elapsed before that pledge was acted upon, but in that delay he was ready to maintain that the Government had only used that degree of proper caution which so material a change in military management and discipline demanded. With respect to the part he (Mr. Grant) had taken when this subject had been brought under the consideration of the house by the hon. member for Middlesex, he was ready to admit that he personally had been overweighed by the military authority expressed by hon. members of that profession on the other side of the house; but he trusted, with the same candour, the house would approve of the circular letter issued from the Horse-Guards with reference to the infliction of corporal punishments. He must implore the house to afford a full opportunity to try the experiment therein recommended, before it should rush into the adoption of the proposition of the hon. and gallant officer opposite. The question for the decision of the house really was, whether or not the experiment had been fairly tried; if not fairly tried, then he admitted that the house could not properly entertain the present proposition. However, he must presume to say, that both with reference to the debate of last year, as well as upon general grounds, there were strong and cogent reasons against the adoption of the proposition now before the house, for he was fully prepared to con-

tend that the experiment, in accordance with the feeling of the house expressed last session, had been fairly tried, but not sufficiently as yet to warrant or authorize any further step by way of change in the system at present pursued. But after this statement he felt it his duty to make another announcement to the house which he most deeply regretted. It was, however, his duty to deal fairly with the house. However sensitively he might deplore the fact that with the decrease of corporal punishments in the military service crime had increased, he must yet admit that this increase could not be entirely ascribed to the absence of corporal punishments. He could not accede to the argument which had been urged upon the house, that if the military authorities were deprived of the power to inflict corporal punishment, a speedy means could be found to remedy the evils arising from the system without endangering the efficiency or discipline of the service; for he did not see in any report which had been made on the subject of secondary punishments (valuable as many of those reports were) any good system pointed out for the adoption of any department of the state. The situation of the Government was at present that of a surgical practitioner hesitating to perform a difficult operation; the hon. member then comes, cuts off the limb with a hatchet, and says, "Now at your peril tie up the arteries—stanch the blood—apply the proper bandages, and take every possible care to save the patient." (Cheers.) The Government was placed in a very difficult position. They had taken the matter into their hands, they were acquainted with the difficulties that surrounded the case, and he trusted they would be allowed to proceed with what they had begun, and be spared the embarrassment of having the power of exercising this species of punishment rashly removed.

The Earl of DARLINGTON next addressed the house, but from the noise occasioned by strangers leaving the gallery, and the repeated calls of "Order" and "Bar" in the house itself, we regret to state that what fell from the noble lord was almost wholly inaudible. He was understood, however, to say, that he objected to the use of corporal punishment, except in extreme cases, and he grounded that opinion on a personal experience of twelve years, during which he had the honour to serve in the army. Every one, however, knew that no good man had anything to fear in the army, although it unfortunately happened that the army was, generally speaking, recruited from the lowest classes of society. He spoke as a military man, and he should be satisfied to abide by the decision of the officers who had been under his command as to the correctness of the principles he had advocated.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM said, that having been twice personally alluded to in the course of this debate, first by the hon. and gallant officer who opened this question, and since, by the right hon. the Judge Advocate, in his reply, he felt it his duty to rise, in order to explain more clearly the circumstance referred to, in connection with the mention of his name. The hon. and gallant member—inadvertently, no doubt—spoke of his (Mr. Buckingham's) abandonment of this question, on what the gallant officer deemed insufficient grounds, and assigned this as his reason for taking it up. The house would probably remember that during the last session, and subsequent to the debate on the motion of the hon. member for Middlesex, he (Mr. Buckingham) had a notice on the books for the abolition of military flogging. On that occasion, when he rose in his place to bring on that motion, the right hon. the Secretary at War (Mr. Ellice) addressed the house, and stated, that not only was this subject under the anxious consideration of his Majesty's Government, but that an order was actually in preparation at the War Office, which would be speedily promulgated to the army, in which the punishment of flogging was strictly enjoined to be confined to the three great crimes, of mutiny, drunkenness on duty, and theft. The right hon. secretary then appealed to his (Mr. Buckingham's) sense of justice to wait at least until the order should be issued, and the effect of the restrictions tried:—and, confiding, as he was not ashamed to confess he did, in the assurance of the right hon. gentleman, that the order alluded to, would restrict the punishment to the offences named, he expressed his willingness, not to *abandon*, but merely to *postpone*, the motion, until the order appeared, and wait until the next session before he renewed any notice on the subject. (Hear.) There was, however, much more delay than had been anticipated.



pated, in the appearance of the order ; for its official publication did not take place until after the session was over ; and candour obliged him to say that when it did appear, it fell far short of the expectation he had been led to form : for, after enumerating the three specific offences already named, it added the words "and other disgraceful conduct," which opened so wide a field for the discretion of the commanding officer, as to enable him to punish almost any offence with flogging, by bringing it within that denomination. He felt, therefore, in common with many other hon. members, extreme sorrow and disappointment at this result, and repented the too willing confidence into which he had been betrayed. Still, however, he would do the right hon. the Secretary at War the justice to express his belief, that had the matter rested with himself individually, or even with the administration with whom he acted, the pledge held out would have been redeemed. But he feared there was a higher power which ruled at the Horse Guards, and which all their influence was unable to control, and that to this power, rather than to the right hon. the Secretary at War, was to be attributed the extension of the offences included within the order alluded to, and its promulgation in that objectionable shape. (Hear, hear.)

On the question now before the house he might be permitted perhaps to offer a very few remarks. No one, he thought, could deny, but that one of the chief characteristics of the barbarism of nations, was the sanguinary nature of their punishments—and one of the surest tests of progressive civilization was, the gradual amelioration of these barbarous practices. In comparing different nations with each other, this was strikingly perceived. If we looked abroad to China, to Persia, to Turkey, we should find their punishments cruel and sanguinary in the extreme. If we regarded the codes of England and America, we should find them comparatively mild and merciful. In the one case, barbarism and ferocity went hand in hand—in the other civilization and mildness gave lustre to each other. To what principle could such a contrast be traced, but to this : that in proportion as men are steeped in the debasement of ignorance, so is it necessary to coerce them by force and suffering, and as brutes to overawe them by brutal punishments ; and that in proportion as men advance in the scale of civilized beings, so is it found advantageous to substitute milder for more cruel remedies, and overawe the mind by the stimuli of hope and fear, rather than lacerate the body by stripes and pain. If we passed from a comparison of nations with each other, and regarded the same nation under different periods of its own history, we should come to the same result. If we looked for instance at England in times past, and compared her civil or military code with times present, what should we perceive, but in the former case, the most cruel and sanguinary tortures, in the latter a gradual abatement of these as civilization advanced, and the substitution of more humane and more rational modes of correction or reformation. (Hear.) It was true that these changes had been slower than could have been wished ; and that too many sanguinary punishments still disgraced our penal code. But he would ask whether it had not been the constant aim of some of the noblest and most benevolent of our fellow-countrymen to remove even those that remained. Why then should not the British soldier be included among the objects of our legislative protection ? (Hear.) We had abolished flogging of the person, as a punishment for civil offences ; we had taken measures, session after session, to mitigate the flogging of Negro slaves, and had now placed it under considerable restrictions, with a view to its speedy and total abolition ; we had seen flogging almost entirely discontinued in the native army of India ; and we had carried our philanthropy so far as to pass an act of Parliament for preventing cruelty to animals, prohibiting or punishing by fines and penalties the infliction of stripes on the bodies of the brute creation ; and yet with strange inconsistency we objected to the abolition of this inhuman torture on the backs of our fellow-countrymen and brave defenders. (Hear, hear, hear.) Did the house suppose that the soldiers of the British army were so ignorant that they did not think of these things—talk of these things, and compare opinions on the great care bestowed on others, and the neglect shown towards themselves ? If so, it deceived itself ; and would do well, before it acted on such an impression, to make it a subject of careful inquiry. But the practice, though admitted to be cruel, was defended on the ground of its producing a salu-

tary example on those who witnessed the punishment, and deterring them from insubordination or other crime. Now, in answer to this, it might be asserted, as matter of notoriety, almost beyond dispute, that the example of such sanguinary punishments had generally the very opposite effect. It excited sympathy for the sufferer, and awakened a feeling of indignation in the witnesses of the pangs under which he groaned; the consequence was, that both in the navy and in the army, wherever the practice of flogging was most frequently resorted to, there the discipline was the most disorderly and disorganized; and in those ships and regiments in which the lash was least used, there the subordination and happiness of all parties was the most complete. (Hear, hear.) He hoped the house would remember well the expression that fell from the right hon. gentleman, the Judge Advocate, who asserted, that in consequence of the large minority on the last division on this question, the Ministry felt themselves bound (as indeed they always did), to respect the powerful expression of opinion, even by minorities, and the order for restricting and mitigating this power of corporal punishment was the result. He intreated hon. members, therefore, who desired to see this cruel practice for the present still further mitigated, and ultimately abolished, to give the motion of the hon. and gallant officer their support, in order that by another large minority, another restrictive order might be obtained, and the punishment still further diminished. (Hear, hear.) ●

There was another reason, however, why the house should speak out on this occasion. There were good grounds for believing that if it depended on the right hon. the Secretary at War, or His Majesty's Ministers, the question would be carried even now. But the military authorities at the Horse-Guards were known to be averse to the measure, and to have power and influence enough to prevent it. It was then a question, whether the voice of the people, as heard in that house, its constitutional organ, through the speeches and votes of its members, or the voice of the commander-in-chief of the army, should prevail. (Hear, hear.) Many hon. members had given to their constituents, at the time of their election, a pledge to promote the abolition of naval and military flogging. Let them now prove the sincerity of those pledges, by acting on them in support of the motion; and let them by this means also assist to rescue the Administration from that secret influence by which they were at present overruled, and make the dignity and power of the House of Commons felt and acknowledged, as the great constitutional power, through which all abuses, whether civil or military, might be most effectually redressed. (Hear, hear.) ●

Mr. LENOARD protested against the use of a degrading punishment, which would naturally have the effect of preventing the better classes of the people from entering the service.

Mr. O'CONNELL said he was of opinion that the British army was the bravest in the world, but there was no body of men into whose hands he would be less disposed to put the power of the lash than into those of the officers—the young officers who formed regimental courts-martial. ("Oh, oh!") He contended that the experiment of doing away with corporal punishment had already been tried, and tried successfully, in the French and Belgian armies ("Hear," and laughter); and he maintained that it was idle to say that the British army, which had shown as great bravery as ever had been witnessed at Waterloo, should be less capable of being kept in a state of discipline without corporal punishment than the French which it had defeated. He trusted at least that the house would not act less kindly to the British soldier than it had with respect to the negro.

Sir HARRY VERNEY said that perhaps the most painful moments of an officer's life were those which passed between the sentence of corporal punishment upon a soldier and the carrying of that sentence into execution. The hon. and learned gentleman had much misunderstood the character and feelings of a British officer. (Hear.) He hoped that this debate would at least have the one good effect—of directing the attention of the house to the question of secondary punishments generally, as well civil as military.

Sir J. BYNG said the hon. and learned member for Dublin, who did not know the character of the British officer (cheers), chose to say that British officers were

the last men to whom he would intrust the power of the lash. Now, he well knew the character and the feelings of the British officer told the house that there were no hands to which that power could be more safely intrusted, no hands in which it would be more mercifully used. (Cheers.) There was already in the army a graduated scale of punishment, he wished there was also a graduated scale of crime. It might be true that of late years corporal punishment had decreased, but in the same proportion had courts-martial increased. There were two regiments in which it was stated that no corporal punishment took place for a long period, but there had been at least twenty courts-martial in each of those corps. His opinion was, that the less the question was agitated in the house the better would it be for the discipline of the army. He said not this simply upon his own authority; he knew that it was a strong feeling with the old soldier. "Take not," said one to him (Sir J. Byng), "the power of corporal punishment from the commanding officer; for if you do, no good man will have peace or comfort in the army."

Mr. SHEL stated that in July, 1832, an order had been made for a return of the number of corporal punishments which had taken place between the years 1825 and 1831, both years being included. He had made inquiry, and ascertained that no such return had been made. It would be of great importance if such a document were forthcoming. It would show that the amount of corporal punishment had been diminished by that very agitation of the question which the gallant general condemned.

Mr. ELLICE said, that the return to which the hon. member for Tipperary had referred was not moved for during his administration. The returns on the table had been framed in compliance with the motion of the hon. member for Middlesex. When this subject was before the house last session, he (Mr. Ellice) said that he would act in conformity with what he perceived to be the feelings of the house, but that he would reserve to himself the privilege of deciding in what terms the order should be drawn up that was to be issued to the army, and he hoped that he should obtain credit for having shown a disposition to meet the wishes of those who condemned the practice of flogging. If the terms of the circular order to the army were by some considered objectionable, he might at least refer to the returns upon the table to show that he had acted in the spirit of the proposition submitted to the house last session, for those returns exhibited a diminution of the number of punishments. If the house would allow the Government to continue in the course which they had hitherto pursued of endeavouring, as far as was possible, consistently with the maintenance of discipline and the security of the civil subject, to diminish the number of inflictions of corporal punishment, the object which the hon. and gallant member for Barnstaple had in view, would be much sooner attained than by the adoption of the resolution now proposed. The right hon. gentleman concluded by observing, in reference to what had fallen from an hon. member, that ministers required not the hint of a large minority to instruct them in their duty. They would persevere in the course they had commenced, whether the question were agitated in that house or not. (Hear, hear.)

Colonel EVANS considered the last observation of the right hon. gentleman uncalled for. For his part, he knew of no better monitor for ministers than a large minority. The abuses which occurred under the system of flogging twenty or thirty years ago were too monstrous to admit of denial, and how had those abuses been corrected but by the agitation which the right hon. gentleman now deprecated. (Hear.) Whenever a strong feeling existed out of doors upon any subject, it must necessarily be agitated in that house, and the objection which the people of this country entertained to the barbarous system of corporal punishment was too powerful not to force itself on the consideration of Parliament. As long as this degrading punishment was applied to soldiers, the class from which enlistments took place must be of a degraded character.

Lord DUDLEY STUART attributed the diminution of the number of punishments in the army to the agitation of the question. It was useless for Ministers to affect a disregard of minorities, when it was notorious that the amelioration which had been introduced by the general order was the result of the large

minority on the subject last session. He was most anxious for the abolition of flogging, but he would not vote for the motion before the house, because he believed that the Government were doing all in their power to effect that object, and because the hon. and gallant mover had not proposed any substitute for the existing system.

Sir E. CODRINGTON said it had been erroneously stated, that on board the fleet good discipline and paucity of punishment went hand in hand. The fact was, that discipline prevailed in proportion as the punishments, be they severe or slight, were justly inflicted. (Hear, hear.)

Sir G. GREY said, that though he supported the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Middlesex last year, he must oppose the present one because it could lead to no practical result. He thought that a degrading punishment might be applied to an offence of a disgraceful description, but he protested against the power given by the Mutiny Act of inflicting torture.

Mr. M. PHILIPS had voted in favour of this motion last year, but he should now vote against it. He thought that Government was pursuing a proper course, and would give them his confidence on this subject for another year.

Mr. HAWES expressed similar sentiments to those of the last speaker.

Capt. CURTEIS would give a contrary example. Last year he voted against the motion, he now declared his intention to vote for the motion, and referred to the case of a man who had been punished for being "perpetually drunk;" but the noise which prevailed in the house rendered it impossible to hear the particulars.

Mr. HUME said, that if Ministers possessed the power of abolishing flogging he would leave the subject in their hands, but they had not the power. The pledges which they gave last year had not been honestly carried into effect. The Commander-in-Chief had told the army that in issuing the circular order he had merely complied with the direction of the House of Commons. Such an order had never been issued before. The Commander-in-Chief ruled the country. ("Oh!") He did as he pleased (hear); and Ministers would have no power to act on this subject, unless the house did their duty and strengthened their hands.

Lord W. LENNOX opposed the motion. The house then divided, when there appeared for Major Fancourt's clause, 94; against it, 227.

#### • VALUE AND IMPORTANCE OF FREE DISCUSSION.

THE most capital advantage an enlightened people can enjoy, is the liberty of discussing every subject which can fall within the compass of the human mind; while this remains, freedom will flourish; but should it be lost or impaired, its principles will neither be well understood nor long retained. To render the magistrate a judge of truth, and engage his authority in the suppression of opinions, shows an inattention to the nature and design of political society. When a nation forms a government, it is not wisdom but power which they place in the hand of the magistrate; from whence it follows, his concern is only with those objects which power can operate upon. On this account the administration of justice, the protection of property, and the defence of every member of the community from violence and outrage, fall naturally within the province of the civil ruler, for these may all be accomplished by power; but an attempt to distinguish truth from error, and to countenance one set of opinions to the prejudice of another, is to apply power in a manner mischievous and absurd. To comprehend the reasons on which the right of public discussion is founded, it is requisite to remark the difference between *sentiment* and *conduct*. The behaviour of men in society will be influenced by motives drawn from the prospect of good and evil: here then is the proper department of Government, as it is capable of applying that good and evil by which actions are determined. Truth, on the contrary, is quite of a different nature, being supported only by *evidence*, and, as when this is represented, we cannot withhold our assent, so where this is wanting, no power or authority can command it.—Robert Hall.

## THE TWO MORNINGS' DEBATE—ON THE NEW SCALE OF DUTIES ON TEA.

THE morning sittings of the House of Commons were expressly instituted for the presentation of petitions, so as to clear the evening sittings of that impediment to the more general business of the country; the three hours set apart, from twelve to three o'clock, allowing of short discussions on such of the petitions as elicit them. The morning sitting of Monday, the 17th, was selected for the presentation of a petition from the city of London, against the new scale of duties to be levied on tea, after the month of June next, as settled by the Tea Duties' Act, passed at the close of last session. The petition was consigned to the care of Mr. Crawford, one of the members for the city of London; but as the order in which gentlemen shall be entered on the list for presenting petitions, is determined by ballot, it is impossible to claim precedence.

This is a matter so little understood in the country, that it may be worth the explanation. About eleven o'clock in the forenoon, all members who have petitions forwarded to them for presentation to the House of Commons, are seen hastening down across Palace-yard, and through Westminster Hall, to get their names on the petition list for the day. On reaching the House, they congregate about the table, where small slips of paper are prepared for receiving each member's name, and a large glass vessel or urn is placed on the table to contain them. At half-past eleven, to a minute, a young clerk, who has daily charge of this proceeding, stops the entry of any further names for putting into the urn, and proceeds to shake up those deposited, and then to draw them out at random. Some member usually takes the Public Petition List, which is ruled and numbered with figures and lines, and as the clerk calls out the name, it is entered on the list, till all are drawn out in succession. The number on the list will sometimes be fifty, to which will often be added, some ten or twenty late arrivals, who, from lying a few minutes too late in bed, or lingering over breakfast, or waiting to see their letters by the post, or lagging by the way, or any other cause, come rushing out of breath into the House, and find themselves just a minute too late, when their chance for the day is gone; and their woeful countenances do not look the brighter for the self-congratulating laughter that is heard from their more fortunate brother senators as they enter after the urn is closed. The whole scene is highly entertaining. Elderly gentlemen are to be seen, with a dozen or twenty rolls of parchment under their arms, which they have brought down day after day to the House for a month in succession, and always been either too late for the ballot, or too low on the list, and consequently lost their turn. If they should get to be called first on the list, after all their patient long-suffering, the joy that beams on their countenances

is like the sun bursting forth on a cloudy day. If they should be just at that point on the list which renders it possible that they may be called, yet not quite certain, their anxiety is proportionately great; and we have never seen looks of greater earnestness, sometimes almost piteously imploring, than when advancing towards three o'clock; some Member, who stands next on the list to be called, the only chance he has had for several weeks, is preceded by a lengthy and tedious person, who repeats and hesitates, and prolongs what he has to say, as if for the purpose of trying the temper of his next successor, who is to be seen alternately looking at the clock, and the member, and the chair, until the anxiety becomes as intense as at the moment of victory in a race—when the Speaker, at the very second that the clock reaches the hour of three, and the member on his legs is about to sit down, leaves the expectant petitioner in despair, with all his time lost, and the chance of the ballot to be encountered again for weeks more in succession, till fortune shall crown him with a higher place on the list.

In the case in question, Mr. Crawford very ingeniously surmounted the difficulty, by asking Mr. Hutt, who stood early on the list, to go through the formality of *presenting* the petition, when he, Mr. Crawford, could, according to the forms of the House, rise to second it, and then make his speech on the subject; and as Lord Althorp and others of the Cabinet Ministers had come down on purpose to attend the discussion, this was the most convenient course for all parties.

The discussion lasted till three o'clock, to the exclusion of all other petitions, when the Speaker left the chair. It was resumed again on Tuesday at twelve, and prolonged till three on the same day, to the exclusion of all other subjects, so that it had six hours' good discussion, and all the points of the matter were thoroughly examined.

To give a report of the debate would be impossible—the daily papers even do not attempt to do that—because no paper, even if printed on a double sheet every day, would contain all that is said in the Morning and Evening sittings, which on Tuesday, occupied from twelve to three in the afternoon, and from five to three in the morning, or thirteen hours; the matter spoken in any one hour being enough to fill three columns of *The Times*, and about nine pages of this REVIEW, so that a verbatim report of the thirteen hours speaking in one day, would make more than one hundred pages of our smallest sized type, in which the debates are usually printed. But as no person can command thirteen hours a-day to read all that might be said in a thirteen hours' sitting in the House of Commons, abridgment becomes indispensable; and the only thing requisite is, to execute this task in such a manner as to catch the most material points—present them in a striking light, and so furnish a clear conception of the general result of the whole. This, at least, is always our aim: and the nearer we approach it, the more we shall be satisfied. In this spirit we shall give a brief sketch of the history of the debate, and present the substance of the views we embodied in a speech delivered on this occasion, which, we think, will be found to make the case quite intelligible.

Mr. Crawford introduced the subject in a very calm and business-like manner; and stated the prayer of the petition entrusted to his care by the London tea-dealers, which complained of the new scale of duties affixing 1*s.* 6*d.*, 2*s.* 2*d.*, and 3*s.* per lb. on the several classes of Bohea, Congou, and Souchong teas, as impracticable to be levied with-

out opening the door to great fraud ; and recommended one single duty only, the middle one of 2*s.* 2*d.* per lb. on all kinds of tea, without reference to their quality, kind, or price.

Lord Althorp, in reply to Mr. Crawford, admitted that there might be difficulties in the way of determining the exact classes subject to the different duties ; though he did not conceive the difficulties to be so great as were imagined, since brokers of the City had given proofs of their competency to perform this task. He instanced the case of America, where this classification had been used with success ; and he thought that the Government ought to be allowed to make the experiment, at least, on the plan they had devised, before it was denounced as impracticable. He defended the lower duties on the low priced teas, and the higher on the high priced teas, on the ground that it was but just to tax the rich more heavily than the poor, and make the duty bear a proportionate ratio to the price.

Sir Robert Peel followed Lord Althorp. He objected to the Government plan of the three rates of duty at their present amounts, and he equally objected to the single duty, proposed by the London dealers ; but all that he recommended was, that the Government should reconsider the subject with a view to its revision. He stated that both plans would present great temptations, the one to fraud, the other to smuggling ; and mentioned that in 1784, though thirteen millions of pounds of tea were consumed in Great Britain, only five millions were legally imported, all the rest being smuggled, which induced Mr. Pitt to introduce the Commutation Act, and he reduced the duties so low, in order to destroy the smuggling, that the revenue from 800,000*l.* a-year, on this article alone, was reduced to 170,000*l.*

Mr. Robinson opened the discussion on the second day, Tuesday. He opposed the London plan of the single duty, and showed clearly, that it would be most unjust to the poorer classes, who he said, were always more heavily taxed in proportion to their means than their richer neighbours, by every fiscal regulation that was ever passed by the House. He supported the Government plan, because he thought it more fair to the consumer than the London traders' proposition.

Mr. Lyall, Member for London, a great shipowner, and East India Director, said he had never met with any single person in all the City who approved the scale of duties affixed by the plan of the Government, which he declared to be wholly impracticable.

Sir George Strickland, Mr. Hawes, Mr. Hume, Sir George Staunton, Mr. Grote, Mr. Pigott, and Mr. Young, each took part in the debate, as well as Mr. Poulett Thomson and Mr. Charles Grant ; and we joined in the discussion among the rest. As the observations we took occasion to adduce, embraced the whole of the question instead of being confined to any particular part, and concluded with the suggestion of a plan, differing entirely from that of the triple scale of rated duty proposed by the Government, or the single-rated duty proposed by the London merchants ; and as it embraced the principles admitted as the proper basis of taxation by most of the speakers, but not applied by either of them in the same manner, it will give, we think, a clearer view of the whole question, to print it verbatim as reported from delivery, on the grounds already stated, namely, to place before our readers, in the shortest compass, the gist and essence of the whole question.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM said—When the Tea Duties Act of the last session was passing through the House of Commons, I was one of the first among its members who ventured to predict, that the scale by which these duties was to be levied, would be found unjust and impracticable. The opinion was then, I know, disregarded; but the discussion of yesterday and to-day, springing out of the petitions that have been presented, prove too clearly that it would have been well for His Majesty's Ministers if they had then given more attention to that opinion than they did, as events would not then have forced it upon them as they have done now. On that occasion, I remember well, that the right hon. the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Spring Rice), assumed great credit to the Government, for having, on changing the mode of levying the duties from an *ad valorem* to a fixed rate, paid such attention to the interests of the humbler classes, as to reduce the duty on tea, by that change, from 96 to 80 per cent. I undertook to show, however, that directly the reverse of this would happen, and that instead of any decrease, the change would absolutely produce a large increase of duty, as compared with price; and so accurate was this calculation, as opposed to that of the right hon. the Secretary to the Treasury, that we have now the admission of the petitioners, as well as of the speakers on both sides of the house, that the new scale of tea duties, while it will reduce the rate of duty on the higher priced teas, or those consumed by the most wealthy, from 100 to 75 per cent. *ad valorem*, and lighten the tax to the rich by 25 per cent., will actually increase the duty on the lower priced teas, or those consumed only by the poorer classes, from 96 to 200 per cent. *ad valorem*; far exceeding, therefore, in the difference between the two extremes, any thing I had ventured to predict, though that prediction, moderate as it was, was disregarded because of its supposed extravagance. The Ministers and the country must now see their error; and fortunately it is not yet too late to retrieve it. (Hear.)

• In adverting to the discussion that has just taken place, I will admit that the question now under consideration is one of the greatest importance in a financial, as well as in a commercial point of view. There is no single article perhaps from which so large a revenue has been drawn, with so much ease and at so little expense in the collection, as that of tea. There is no other article, bread alone excepted, which is now so universally consumed by all classes of the people, as tea; and, therefore, any change about to be made in the proportion of these duties, or in the mode of collecting them, requires the utmost care. Hitherto, the duty has been 96 per cent. on the selling price of the coarser teas, and 100 per cent. on the selling price of the finer teas; and the place of sale being exclusively confined to the India House, in London, the collection has been extremely easy. It is now intended to change this simple *ad valorem* duty into a rated one, and to place a tax of a certain amount per pound, instead of determining that tax as heretofore by the value. The new duty is to be 1*s.* 6*d.* per pound on all Bohea teas, 2*s.* 2*d.* per pound on all Congou teas, and 3*s.* per pound on all teas of the finer kinds, not included in these two classes. The defence set up for this classification is, that it is founded on the principle of an *ad valorem* duty, and puts the higher tax on the more costly article, for the sake of lightening the burthen to the poor. This defence is, however, not merely fallacious, but absolutely false, as directly the reverse is produced by the new system. For instance, the price of the coarser kind of Bohea being, at such of the continental ports as enjoy a free trade in that article, 9*d.* per pound, and the duty affixed to it by the new scale 1*s.* 6*d.*, the rate of duty is just 200 per cent. on the value. On the other hand, the most costly of the finer teas being at the free trade price of 4*s.* per pound, and the duty affixed to it by the new scale being 3*s.*, the rate of duty is only 75 per cent. on the value, thus placing heavier burthens on the poor, who are too heavily laden already, and at the same time lightening the burthen to the rich, who are the best able to bear it. (Hear, hear.)

One most powerful objection then to such a classification of duties as this, is its positive injustice; to which might perhaps be added another, namely, the cruelty and impolicy of taxing any article of food at all; and tea, by the universality of its consumption, has become as much a necessary of life as almost any other article, save bread alone, and the privation of it would be felt in an extreme



degree by all classes. It is worthy of remark, however, that whenever the subject of a property tax is mentioned in the House of Commons, its principle is always recognized as sound in theory; and the chief objection urged to it is, the inquisitorialness of it when reduced to practice. It is admitted as a maxim of sound policy, that men should contribute to the support of the state in proportion to their respective means of wealth, as the fairest and most unexceptionable standard. But it is mortifying to observe that when any tax is about to be taken off, or new one about to be put on, this principle is violated in the most flagrant manner. The House Tax and the Duties on Tea are both cases in point. The former, if fairly and equitably assessed, as a certain per centage on the actual cost or value of the house, comes the nearest to a property tax of almost any that could be devised; for it may be admitted as a general rule, that as men increase in wealth, they enlarge and adorn their dwellings: and the difference is extreme between the humblest cottage of the peasant, which might be built for 10*l.*, and the lordly mansions of Chatsworth, Belvoir Castle, Eaton Hall, and other princely mansions of the nobility, which could not be built and completed for less than 1,000,000*l.*, or one hundred thousand times as much as the humble dwelling of the peasant. That tax, however, one of the fairest and most just, if apportioned according to actual cost and value, is to be taken off, and the rich will be chiefly relieved by this; while the new duties on Tea are to be so shaped as to produce three millions and a half or four millions of annual revenue, the chief burden of which will fall most heavily on the poor. Without reverting to the injustice of making the labouring mechanic pay a duty of 200 per cent. on his consumption of tea, as tax, while the duke and the marquis pay only 75 per cent. on the cost price of all they may use; let the house look at the difference of the amount which each party contributes to the revenue, as compared with their means. The poor man, who has 50*l.* a-year, consumes, we will suppose, a pound of tea per month; and in so doing, he pays 18*s.* in the year as *his* share of the four millions of taxes raised on tea. The noble peer, with an income of 50,000*l.* a-year, will not consume more than two pounds of tea per month; and in so doing, he will contribute 72*s.* in the year, as *his* share of the same tax raised on tea. Surely every one must see that if the principle of taxing men in proportion to their means of wealth, were strictly adhered to, the noble lord, with his income of 50,000*l.* a-year, ought to consume, or at least pay duty on, one thousand times as much tea per annum, as his poorer neighbour, at 50*l.* a-year; for then, and then only, would their respective contributions to the Exchequer, be in exact relation to their power of payment: and whether the mechanic of 50*l.* a-year could spare 18*s.*, or a peer of 50,000*l.* a-year spare 72*s.* with the least inconvenience, as their respective contributions to the state, it would not be difficult to judge; nor, if there be truth in figures, and arithmetic is not wholly a delusion, can these proportions be denied or refuted. (Hear.)

In addition, however, to these theoretical objections to the new scale of duties on tea, there is this great practical objection, that all men conversant with the subject, declare it absolutely impossible to determine the difference between the better sort of Bohea and the inferior sorts of Congou, which approach each other so nearly as to baffle the skill of the most experienced, to separate the one from the other; though by the new scale, the duty on the finest Bohea will be 1*s.* 6*d.*; and the duty on the coarsest Congou will be 2*s.* 2*d.*; a difference of 8*d.* in the duty, though there may not be a difference of 1*d.* in the price; some good Boheas having indeed sold at higher rates than bad Congous. Who does not see then, in an instant, that this difficulty and uncertainty will open the door to all manner of frauds?—that the temptation to enter Congous as Boheas, for the sake of avoiding the higher duty, will be irresistible; fortified, as the committer of the fraud will be, with the conviction that he cannot be detected, and that if he keeps his counsel, his dishonesty can never be exposed? This would be the case, even now; but a year or two hence, when the skilful and ingenious Chinese will have been apprized of the advantages of preparing the several kinds of teas, on purpose to deceive the inspectors here, all the teas imported for general consumption will be brought to England under the lower class denominations, for the sake of profiting by the lower duty; and dishonesty in dealing, and frauds upon the revenue, will

thus be engendered and encouraged by our own imprudent legislation. If we add to this, the consideration, that the importation of tea is no longer to be confined to the port of London, but that the outports are to become their own importers—that each outport will have to be provided with its own inspector, with whom alone will rest, without appeal, the decision of which is Congou, and which is Bohea; if we consider that on the cargo of a large ship, in which, for many reasons, it will be for some time advantageous to import the tea, a difference of the duty between Bohea and Congou, would amount to 10,000*l.*, all of which might be saved by the mere decision of the inspector, on so uncertain a standard as shade of colour—peculiarity of flavour—or even still more capricious tests of taste—it must be admitted, that greater temptations to fraud can hardly be conceived. (Hear.)

This scale of the Government is clearly impracticable, and must be abandoned. Let us see, however, what remedy the merchants of the city of London propose. They recommend the relinquishment of the highest and the lowest duty; and the retention of the middle one only, of 2*s.* 2*d.* per pound, for every description of tea, so as to form one uniform rate of charge on all. This, no doubt, has simplicity in its favour, and as far as the saving of trouble, and preventing fraud can recommend it, it is deserving of attention. But surely the House of Commons will never countenance any thing so unjust, as that the tea of the poor man's family, the original cost of which is 9*d.* per lb., shall be taxed at three times its value, or 300 per cent., by the duty of 2*s.* 2*d.*; while the tea of the rich man's family, the original cost of which is 7*s.* per lb., shall be taxed at only one-third its value, or 33 per cent. by the same duty of 2*s.* 2*d.* If it sanctions such a scale as this, it will belie all its professions of a regard to the interests of the poor:—it will contradict all its admiration of the true theory of taxation, that the contributions made to the revenue should be in proportion to the means of those who contribute;—and it will bring down upon it the deserved condemnation of the country. (Hear, hear, hear.)

\* The only public objects we should have in view in the contemplated change should be, to secure the full amount of the revenue which we may think fit to derive from this source, from all diminution by fraud; to make the duty proportioned to the value of the article on which it is imposed; and to offer no temptation either to the smuggler or the dishonest dealer. To combine these objects then, I will venture to suggest a plan, which differs both from that of the Government, and that of the London merchants, confident that upon examination it will be found to combine all the advantages of both, while it will possess the defects of neither. It is this:—

1. That the importation of tea from China should be confined to those ports only which will undertake to provide bonded warehouses for its reception: and wherever the population is considerable, and the ships numerous, the means of erecting such warehouses can be easily obtained.

2. That at such ports all teas imported should be landed and lodged in these bonded warehouses only.

3. That periodical sales of such teas as the importers chose to draw from the bonded warehouses, should be made by public auction, once a month, on some fixed day, under the superintendence of the Customs, and the duty being *ad valorem*, whether 50, or 75, or 100 per cent. on the actual price produced at the sale, would be payable by the purchaser at the time of his withdrawing his teas from the warehouse.

This is a mode by which all uncertainty as to classes and qualities would be obviated; by which all temptation to fraud would be shut out, nay, rendered impossible; and by which, at the same time, these two vast advantages would be united; that the revenue would be collected with the greatest certainty and the least expence; and each description of tea bearing an *ad valorem* duty according to its price, the consumers of the costly tea would pay the heavy duty, the drinkers of the middle qualities would pay the moderate impost, and the purchasers of the cheapest tea would be most lightly taxed of all. As to the practicability of its working well, we have the experience of upwards of a century in its favour, this being the manner in which the duties on tea have been

collected during that space of time—with constant commendation of its simplicity, certainty, and economy.

There is one consideration of this great question, however, which has been wholly overlooked, both by the Government and the House of Commons, though it is, perhaps, the most important of all. It is that of seeking how we could augment the consumption of tea beyond its present quantity. Now what is the actual state of the case? At the present moment, the consumption of England, Scotland, and Ireland, is 33 millions of pounds weight, and as the population of the three countries is estimated at 25 millions of persons, this makes an average consumption of about one pound and a quarter of tea per head per annum. Every one must admit this to be a miserable pittance, compared with what would be consumed, were it not that the high price, and the high duty, combine to make it so dear, that even the most respectable families are niggardly and parsimonious in the careful doling out of tea, though profuse in every thing else, because of its high price, while thousands are debarred the use of it at all because it is beyond their means of purchase. If, then, by a reduction of the *ad valorem* duty from 100 to 75 or 50 per cent. the consumption could be doubled in quantity, as well as augmented in the better qualities at the same time—and there are really no persons who would not drink either more, or better tea, if the price were greatly reduced—what would be the effect? Undoubtedly this, that twice the number of British ships would be employed in importing the tea from China, a change which would give more relief to our shipping interests than any other single measure that could be named; and that for every additional cargo of tea imported from China, an additional cargo of British manufactures would go out to be consumed among the millions of that country, instead of the opium cultivated by the monopoly of the India Company, and the silver drained from the revenues of Bengal, which have hitherto been the materials with which the teas have been paid for at Canton. Our manufacturers would therefore receive as great an advantage from the augmented consumption of tea, by the demand for their productions in exchange, as the shipping interest would be benefited by the increased employment of their tonnage for its conveyance; and, therefore, in every point of view in which it can be regarded, the plan which I have ventured to suggest will be found worthy the attention of His Majesty's Government.

With these views, Sir, I beg to urge upon their attention the propriety of relinquishing their own cumbrous and impracticable plan, and at the same time of rejecting the more simple, but still more unjust plan, proposed to them by the City of London; and rather themselves to reconsider the subject, with a view to some revision emanating from their own hands, or if that be difficult or disagreeable, to confide the new arrangement to a Select Committee of competent persons, before whom the details may be discussed, and some general measure founded thereon, which shall give satisfaction to the country, and combine all the advantages of simplicity, practicability, and above all, of fairness and justice to every class engaged either in the importation, sale, or consumption of this wholesome and agreeable article of almost universal use. (Hear, hear.)

#### OBJECTIONS TO THOSE WHO WOULD WISH TO STAY THE PROGRESS OF KNOWLEDGE.

It seems a favourite point with a certain description of men to stop the progress of inquiry, and throw mankind back into the darkness of the middle ages, from a persuasion that ignorance will augment their power, as objects look largest in a mist. There is in reality no other foundation for that alarm which they express. Whatever is not comprehended under revelation, falls under the inspection of reason; and since from the whole course of Providence, it is evident, that all political events, and all the revolutions of government are effected by the instrumentality of men, there is no room for supposing them too sacred to be submitted to the human faculties. The more minds there are employed in tracing their principles and effects, the greater probability will there be of the science of civil policy, as well as every other, attaining to perfection.—*Robert Hall.*

## MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE great space occupied by the report of the more important debates of the week, leaves us only room to present in this abridged form a summary of the other proceedings of the House of Commons, which we shall record in chronological order, appending, as we go along, such observations as may be necessary to make the subject, clearly understood, and thus presenting a rapid but accurate view of all that has transpired since our last.

On Wednesday, the 12th inst., a discussion took place on the disfranchisement of Hertford, on the motion of Mr. Bernal, for the second reading of the bill for that purpose, when Lord George Somerset, supported by several Tory members, endeavoured to get rid of the bill, by moving as an amendment that it should be read that day six months; but after the exposure of the corruptions of Hertford, the proposition met so little approbation that it was ultimately withdrawn.

•The Bill for exempting Roman Catholic priests from the existing penalties on marrying persons in Scotland, brought in by Mr. Murray, of Leith, was read a second time without opposition, and will no doubt pass.

The Bill for disfranchising the Liverpool freemen, under the charge of Mr. Benett, went into committee, after some opposition on the part of Mr. Hodgson, Sir Henry Willoughby, Lord Sandon, Mr. Nicholl, and Mr. Gladstone, but on a division the numbers were, For the Bill going into Committee, 106; Against it 14. In the course of a subsequent part of the debate on the same subject, a sharp altercation took place between the Speaker and Mr. Wason, on an expression of the latter in reference to a doubt expressed by Lord Sandon, as to Mr. Wason's word; but on Lord Sandon's disavowal, it ended pacifically, and without further results elsewhere.

On Thursday, the debate on Mr. Rippon's motion for the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords, occupied the greater part of the evening, the report of which we have given at great length, because the question is new, important, and one which cannot be considered as disposed of yet. The remainder of the evening was occupied in a discussion on a correspondence between the Board of Admiralty, and certain master coopers, assisting them to resist the combination of their journeymen to obtain higher wages, which was condemned as an improper interference of the Government authority between master and man.

On Friday, the 14th, Sir James Graham introduced, with great clearness and ability, the heads of the new bill for regulating the future management of the Exchequer. The recent death of Lord Grenville, who for many years had held the sinecure place of Teller of the Ex-

chequer, had enabled the Government to turn their attention to the necessary changes ; and they had resolved to abolish at once all the cumbrous machinery of the old Court, where the accounts were kept in a kind of Latin which no one but the Exchequer clerks understood, where the Roman numerals, or letters of the alphabet, were used in all the books, instead of the Arabic numerals, or ordinary figures of arithmetic. The number of persons employed were to be reduced from 65 to 29 ; and the cost of the establishment from 41,000*l.* to 11,000*l.* per annum. The dismissed officers were to have compensations in superannuation allowances for life ; and the Marquis of Camden, who has for many years munificently given up his fees as Teller of the Exchequer, amounting to seven or eight thousand a year, was still to have them placed at his disposal, to be dealt with as he thought fit, to mark the sense of the House as to its confidence in Lord Camden's public virtue. On the same evening, Friday, the clause of Major Fancourt, for the abolition of Military Flogging, was proposed to be added to the Mutiny Bill ; the debate on which we have reported at length elsewhere.

On Monday, the 17th, the business of the house was extremely varied. The discussion on the Tea Duties, which we have reported in another place, occupied nearly all the morning sitting. In the evening Mr. Buxton asked Mr. Stanley several questions relative to the working of the Slave Emancipation Bill in the Colonies ; the answers to which were most gratifying, confirming, indeed, all that we had ventured to predict, during the discussion of the Bill last year ; and showing that the system of apprenticeships would be found so cumbrous and unmanageable, that as soon as the money payments should be secured by law, the masters would, for their own comfort and profit, begin to emancipate the slaves themselves. Mr. Stanley stated, that in Antigua, the legislature had already passed a law, doing away with apprenticeships altogether, for the purpose of giving the slaves complete emancipation, on the 1st of August next. In Jamaica he had reason to believe the same thing was in contemplation. In Demarara, the negro population were so tranquil and happy, in the prospect of their emancipation, that out of a number of 80,000 slaves, there had been in the last month, only thirteen complaints, and not one of them were visited with any corporal punishment. He said also that the Court of Policy in Demarara, composed chiefly of planters, and wholly unconnected with Government, had unanimously passed an ordinance, without one dissentient voice, abolishing, from the 1st of March, 1834, the power of the masters to inflict corporal punishment on their slaves for any offence whatever. This is gratifying indeed to all those who advocated this great measure of emancipation, and predicted these as its certain results, in opposition to the alarmists, who contended that if we broke the fetters of the slaves, they would rise in a body, and cut the throats of all the whites in the islands. But the contrast afforded by the abolition of slavery and flogging by the West India planters, in the same year that the Whig Ministers refuse to abolish impressment and flogging in England, is, we confess, such as we could not have thought possible, had it not actually occurred.

In the same evening, on the motion that the Speaker should leave the chair, for the purpose of going into a Committee of Supply, Mr. Cobbett moved, as a resolution, That from and after the 5th of October

next, the whole of the malt duty should be taken off." As we have given the report of two great debates on this subject in previous Numbers, it is the less necessary to repeat the arguments here. Mr. Cobbett advocated the repeal for the benefit of the farmers and the labouring classes. Lord Althorp resisted the motion, on the ground of its having been already recently decided, and of the impossibility of sparing the large amount (nearly five millions), or of providing an easy substitute for it. Sir William Ingilby defended his former conduct, in moving for the repeal, and supported the present motion. Mr. Fergusson condemned the property-tax, the only substitute proposed, as odious and inquisitorial. Mr. Sinclair, Mr. M. Philips, and Mr. Maxwell, defended the proposition of a property-tax. Mr. T. Attwood said the Government would neither reduce the burthens of the people to a level with their means, nor lift up their means to a level with their burthens; and if they did not do either the one or the other soon, nothing but ruin would await us. Mr. Stanley endeavoured to put an end to the debate, by contending, that it was a waste of the public time to discuss the question now that it had been so recently disposed of. Mr. Robinson said, the only remedy for all our difficulties was, a tax on the wealth and property of the country. Mr. Bruce advocated the repeal of the duty on malt, and an increased duty on ardent spirits. Mr. Pigott opposed the repeal. At length a division was called for, when the numbers appeared\* to be—For the total repeal of the Malt-tax after the 5th of October, 50.—Against it 142.

The question was again put, "that the Speaker do now leave the chair," for the purpose of going into a Committee of Supply, when Mr. Sheil rose, "to move for copies of all communications passing between the British and Russian Government, relative to a treaty concluded between Russia and Turkey, on the 8th of last July." He made a very long and able speech, in which he recapitulated all the events of the war between Russia and Turkey on the one hand, and Mohammed Ali and the Sultan on the other. He accused the British Ministers of neglect, in not having had an ambassador at Constantinople for six months, during a most critical period; and said that we had been outwitted by the Russian ambassador, who had obtained, without our knowledge or concurrence, a treaty with the Porte, by which the Russians were favoured with the power of closing the passage of the Dardanelles against us in the event of a war, though it should be open to themselves. Lord Palmerston made a very weak and unsatisfactory reply, refusing the papers, on the ground that explanations were still going on respecting the treaty in question, and that until these were terminated, the papers could not be produced. Sir Robert Peel made a most effectual and admirable speech against Lord Palmerston, full of the most cutting sarcasm and powerful ridicule, as well as strengthened by the soundest reasoning. We never remember to have heard him to greater advantage. Mr. Stanley sat all the while beside his friend and colleague, Lord Palmerston, looking daggers; and when Sir Robert Peel sat down he rose instantly to reply to him. In point of skill and power as debaters, they are nearly equal, though each in a different way. But there are no two men upon whom the consciousness of a bad cause seems to operate more unfavourably. On some occasions we have heard Mr. Stanley triumphant over Sir Robert Peel.

To-night the tables were turned entirely, and nothing could be more heavy, awkward, cold, and lifeless, than Mr. Stanley's attempt to answer Sir Robert Peel's unanswerable speech. At the close of the discussion, however, as Mr. Sheik was satisfied with the publicity given to the subject by the debate, he withdrew his motion, and no division took place.

It was past one o'clock when Mr. Fergusson rose to move, in the Committee of Supply, a grant of 5000*l.* to Captain Ross, for his sufferings and services in the late Polar Expedition. It was opposed only by Sir Robert Inglis, and supported by a great many members, though the general feeling being in favour of referring the motion to a Select Committee, for the purpose of reporting the ground on which the grant was asked, the motion was withdrawn for that purpose: and the House did not adjourn till near three o'clock in the morning!—an hour at which it is certainly most improper to vote away the public money for any purpose whatever; though it is nearly always after midnight that the business of the Committee of Supply is transacted.

On Tuesday, the 18th, the Tea Duties formed the subject of debate during the whole of the morning sitting. In the evening, the question of Church Rates underwent a discussion, on a motion brought forward by Mr. Divett, in a resolution to this effect, "That it is just and expedient to take effectual measures for the abolition of all compulsory payments of Church Rates." The proposition was seconded by Mr. Hall, and supported by Mr. Wilks, Mr. Briscoe, Mr. Baines, and Mr. O'Connell. It was opposed by Mr. Goulburn, Sir Robert Inglis, and Mr. Sinclair; while Lord Althorp, Lord John Russell, and Dr. Lushington, took the middle course, of admitting the desirability of relieving the Dissenters from the payment of Church Rates, but wishing the subject to be left in the hands of the Government, more especially as Lord Althorp had himself given notice of a motion on the subject, for an early day; and on these grounds Mr. Divett consented to withdraw his motion, and confide the matter to the Ministry.

Colonel Evans obtained leave to bring in a Bill for the better government of Parishes in England and Wales. A conversation (for it was hardly more) occurred on a motion of Mr. Craven Berkley, for a Committee to enquire into the practice of charging a penny on each General Post Letter or Newspaper, delivered within the limits of the town of Cheltenham: the objection made to granting which Committee was this: that it was a practice prevailing in many other towns, and was strictly legal, being sanctioned by a direct act of Parliament; the only remedy for the evil would be, therefore, to move for its repeal. A Committee was appointed, on the motion of Sir Robert Inglis, to inquire into the circumstances connected with the formation of the Glasgow Lottery; in the discussion on which, the morality or immorality of Lotteries was canvassed, but without arriving at any satisfactory decision of that question.

The Solicitor-General, Mr. Pepys, then moved for a Select Committee to consider the existing state of the law of libel and of slander, with a view to their revision: and pointed out many gross incongruities and absurdities in the present law on these subjects. Mr. O'Connell, who has a bill passing through the House on the subject,

supported the motion for a Committee. Sir Frederick Vincent, who took up the subject last session, Sir W. Horne, the late Attorney-General, Mr. Pryme, a barrister, and member for Cambridge, and Mr. Sheil, all supported the motion for a Committee; and after a short speech from Lord Althorp, assenting to the motion, it was carried, and the Committee appointed.

Mr. O'Connell afterwards obtained leave to bring in a bill to improve the navigation of the lakes, rivers, and estuaries of Ireland. And after a tedious and unprofitable discussion on a motion of Mr. Halcomb, for a Committee to inquire into some proceedings connected with the last election for Coventry, which was negatived;—Lord Sandon, in the absence of Mr. Fergusson, obtained a Committee to consider of Captain Ross's claims, and report their opinion on the same;—when the House adjourned at two o'clock, though it had sat on the previous night till three in the morning; so that the House had sat thirteen hours on the one day, and twelve hours on the other, a period of time much too long, to say nothing of the unseasonableness of the hours after midnight, to admit of continued and unbroken attention, and therefore greatly unfavourable to careful and just Legislation.

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR.

### CORRECTION OF AN ALLEGED ERROR WITH RESPECT TO COMMODORE DECATUR.

SIR,

*London, March 10, 1834.*

A gentleman somewhat conversant with the affairs of the United States, begs leave to correct Mr. Buckingham in one or two of his statements relative to Impressment of Seamen, which he rejoices to see Mr. Buckingham has so ably though unsuccessfully attacked.

Decatur never uttered the sentiment attributed to him, but was always astonished that such an expression should be imputed to *him*; not only not all, but not *one* Englishman ever pointed a gun in a vessel in which he commanded. Orders were expressly issued to prevent the enlistment of Englishmen in the American navy, and I believe the order not only exists now but is acted on. Far more confidence is put in an American-bred sailor; and what you wish to bring about would give the English sailor the same character the American sailor now possesses, an *inclination* to fight well, the existence of which would tend to prevent such disasters as occurred during the late war.

J. HAINES.

[We give insertion to the above with great readiness, being only anxious to promote justice and truth. Our authority for the statement of Commodore Decatur is the work of Admiral Ekins, in his History of the Naval Battles of England, as quoted in our last and preceding Numbers. We may add this fact, however, from personal knowledge. In the year 1809 or 10, we happened to be on board an American ship, the *Rising States*, of Marblehead, then lying in the Chesapeake, which was driven on shore in a heavy gale; and the assistance of a launch, and cables, and anchors, being required from Commodore Decatur's frigate, the *United States*, then lying in Norfolk Roads, a party of the best hands, principally fore-castle and fore-top men, were sent to our relief; and out of thirty-eight of the finest-looking men that could be seen, twenty-six admitted that they were British, including English, Irish, and Scotch, and twelve only were Americans. This was of course not a sample of the whole crew; for of 400 men not more than 100 might be British; but these were among the best and most valuable, and greatly assisted to infuse a spirit of seamanship and discipline through the rest of the ship's company.—EDITOR.]



# OPINION OF DISSENTERS AS TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S DISSENTERS' MARRIAGE BILL.

SIR,

*Sydney, March 3, 1834.*

As far as I am able to learn, Lord John Russell's Marriage Bill is any thing but satisfactory to the Dissenters of these neighbourhoods. You know that from the station I occupy, I have no common opportunity to ascertain their general sentiments; and these are entire disappointment, and utter disapprobation of the nibbling, ungracious, half-and-half measure. It is difficult to determine whether it be most oppressive to the clergyman, the Dissenting minister, or the parties to be united. On the first it devolves the unpleasant task of publishing the banns of the marriage of persons who prefer the services of another to his own; on the second, it fixes a stigma of disqualification to perform the ceremony completely, without the sanction of his endowed clerical brother; and on the parties immediately concerned, it entails more trouble and annoyance than is experienced under the existing marriage laws. This is the result of not "beginning at the beginning." Will Ministers ever learn? Time will tell, and will, I hope, tell them that the Dissenters of England will not receive a concession so exceedingly invidious in its operations if it ever pass into a law, but which, I trust, it never will. Let things remain as they are rather. Such I believe to be the general feeling.

Yours, truly,

DEWILY LAN SYRYWG.

## SIR JOHN CAMPBELL—MR. HAWKES—FEELINGS OF THE DIS- SENTERS AT DUDLEY.

SIR,

*Dudley, March 4, 1834.*

Our late representative having at the recent election been rejected by a majority of the constituency, and being determined, as are also many of Sir John Campbell's friends, never to acknowledge Mr. Hawkes as our representative, and further, being an admirer of the principles which you promulgate in THE PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW, I am induced to send you for presentation a Petition from the Baptist Congregation in this town, which has been entrusted to me to forward. The petition embraces the five grievances of which Dissenters generally complain, and prayers for the *ultimate* dissolution of the connection between the Church and the State.

The Bill introduced by Lord John Russell for legalizing the marriages of Dissenters is, in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of every Dissenter in this neighbourhood, an insult rather than a relief. His lordship and the Government must have but a very mean opinion of the Dissenting body to endeavour to palm upon them such an abortion. What! have not Dissenters had enough of contumely hitherto? Must insult be added to injury by that Government which has given them reason to expect so much? Why should other Dissenters be less favoured than the Quakers? They can marry without a certificate from the clergyman; they can marry without taking out a licence for their chapel, as though it were an alehouse; they are not compelled to acknowledge the superiority of the Episcopal Minister, by forwarding to him a quarterly copy of their registers, and why should the Baptists, the Unitarians, or the Methodists?

I know, Sir, you speak your sentiments freely; I beseech you tell it in the House of Commons, that the Dissenters will not accept of such a *legon*. Not one to whom I have spoken but considers it much worse than the existing laws relative to marriage. And tell the honourable House, too, that if the Dissenters chose to be turbulent, or to assert their rights, they in a very few months would save the Legislature the trouble of passing laws for their relief. All that it would have to do, would be to legalize the customs which its present supplicants have introduced.

I have written strongly for I feel warmly, and trusting to your kindness, I remain, Sir, your's most respectfully,

AN ELECTOR OF DUDLEY.

## NECESSITY FOR AN ENTIRE REVISION OF OUR SYSTEM OF TAXATION.

SIR, *Perry Cottage, Black Rock, Ireland.*

THOUGH, in my humble opinion, the proposition of the hon. member for Dublin, for reducing the interest of the national debt, and by this means relieving the national burdens, would be nothing short of public robbery of the fundholder, yet is there much truth in the statement of that gentleman, that the only interest which prospers in the country is the monied interest. This is not the fault of the fundholder, but very much the result of circumstances, not attributable to him, but in as much as he contributed his means to the attainment of an end, beneficial to all.

During the protracted, perhaps some may now think, impolitic war with France, the monied interest came forward to support the nation in a struggle that then at least was considered as affecting our national existence; were we now to turn round on the fundholder and sweep off by a scratch of a pen, *any portion* of the debt due to him, on the same principle we might just as well wipe off the whole, and spare ourselves the repetition of needless scratches, but after such a breach of national faith, who, in the moment of national distress, would again become the public creditor? Policy as well as justice forbids the step so inconsiderately proposed. Still the truth remains indisputable, that the only prosperous interest in the country is the monied interest. How then is this interest to be made to participate in the burdens under which the other interests labour without a breach of faith with the national creditor? Very simply, I conceive. By renewing that tax, of which income was relieved, so modified as not to press on income derived from productive industry.

During the war a stimulus was given to every branch of industry, which enabled it to bear the heavy burdens with which it was loaded; if any one interest held up its head above the rest, it was immediately "thrashed for overtopping," the necessities of the state subjected it to some new impost, and circumstances enabled it to bear the inevitable burden. We were like a giant in a fever, bled while our pulse beat high, but the paroxysm is over, and our strength is prostrated. The stimulus which existed during the war is removed, but the clogs which burdened industry remain with lessened powers to support them.

Something therefore must be done, and the principle advocated by Sir R. Peel is that which I shall propose as the safest to pursue. "It is the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer," says Sir R. Peel, "to remit those taxes, the removal of which, by *increasing the wealth of the country*, directly or indirectly, would assist that class which was most distressed, &c. &c." I hope and trust Sir Robert may continue to advocate this principle; but how stands the matter now? Why, the most strenuous opposition is offered to a tax on *realized* property, but all the machinery employed in the *creation* of property, every means by which the *wealth of the country* is sought to be *increased*, is burdened till it can bear no more;—"Taxed till the brow of labour sweats in vain." Commence then by taxing *already acquired property*. Tax also, if requisite, the *income of productive* industry; but I would here beg leave to observe, that the tax on the income of productive industry should bear a very small proportion to that on fixed; first, as being *contingent* only; and next, as being the result of *labour*: the former should reduce it to one-half the tax on fixed income; the latter to one-half of this again.

For the relief of the AGRICULTURAL INTEREST, then, rescind every tax bearing on it, from the malt-tax down to the tax on the peasant and labourer's brogues. For the relief of the MANUFACTURING INTEREST, abolish the Corn Laws, and the duties on all raw articles of import affecting it. This will relieve the MERCANTILE INTEREST without any specific bonus to it; and when those liberal principles of intercourse are not met by other nations, I would give to our SHIPPING INTEREST an almost exclusive privilege over that of those nations which refused to meet us on principles of reciprocity and mutual interest. This is an imperfect sketch of my views on the subject, hastily put together and unrevised, but I believe it contains the germs of what must be eventually, and perhaps shortly adopted.

I am, Sir, your humble servant,  
R. T. HARVEY.

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

### MINORITY OF 94,

Tellers included, who, on the 14th of March, voted in favour of Major Fancourt's Motion for the Abolition of Flogging in the Army.

#### ENGLAND.

Aglionby, H. A.	Dashwood, G. II.	Hutt, W.	Rotch, B.
Baines, E.	Dawson, E.	Lennard, Sir T.	Strutt, E.
Baillie, J. E.	Divett, E.	Lennard, T. B.	Simeon, Sir R.
Bainbridge, E.	Ewart, W.	Lister, E. C.	Talmash, A. G.
Beaucklerk, Major	Evans, Colonel	Lushington, Dr.	Tennyson, Rt. Hn C.
Beaumont, T. W.	Faithfull, G.	Marjoribanks, S.	Thicknesse, R.
Bish, T.	Fancourt, Major	Mildmay, P.	Tooke, W.
Blake, Sir F.	Fielden, J.	Parrott, J.	Thompson, Alderman
Boss, Captain	Fryer, R.	Pease J.	Todd, J. R.
Brocklehurst, J.	Gaskell, D.	Plumptre, J. P.	Turner, W.
Briscoe, J. I.	Goring, H. D.	Poulter, J. S.	Vincent, Sir F.
Bulwer, H. L.	Grote, G.	Potter, R.	Warburton, II.
Buckingham, J. S.	Guest, J. J.	Rippon, C.	Wason, R.
Buxton, F.	Hall, B.	Robinson, G. R.	Warre, J. A.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Hughes, H.	Romilly, E.	Whalley, Sir S.
Clay, W.	Hume, J.	Romilly, J.	Walter, J.
Curteis, H. B.	Hoskins, K.	Roebuck, J. A.	Wigney, I. N.
Curteis, Captain			

#### SCOTLAND.

Ewing, J.	Oswald, J. I.	Parnell, Sir H.	Stuart, R.
Johnston, A.	Oswald, R. A.	Sinclair, G.	Wallace, R.
Gillon, W. D.			

#### IRELAND.

Bellew, P.	O'Connell, M.	O'Reilly, W.	Sullivan, R. :
Blake, M. J.	O'Connell, M.	Roche, W.	Sheil, R. L.
Jacob, E.	O'Connell, J.	Ruthven, E. S.	Tennant, J. E.
O'Connell, D.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Ruthven, E.	Vigors, N.

### MINORITY OF 60,

Tellers included, who on the 13th of March voted in favour of Mr. Rippon's Motion for "Relieving the Archbishops and Bishops of the Established Church from their Legislative and Judicial duties in the House of Lords."

#### ENGLAND.

Adams, E. H.	Ewart, W.	Kennedy, J.	Roebuck, J. A.
Aglionby, H. A.	Faithfull, G.	Leech, J.	Romilly, J.
Attwood, T.	Ferguson, Sir R. I.	Lister, E. C.	Russell, Lord
Baines, E.	Fielden, J.	Parrott, J.	Sebright, Sir J.
Bewes, T.	Grote, G.	Pease, J.	Staveley, J. K.
Blake, Sir F.	Guest, J. J. I.	Philips, M.	Warburton, H. I.
Buckingham, J. S.	Harvey, D. W.	Potter, R.	Whalley, Sir S.
Buller, C.	Humphery, J.	Richards, J.	Wilks, J.
Chaytor, Sir W.	Ingilby, Sir W.	Rider, T.	Wood, Alderman
Codrington, Sir E.	James, W.		

## SCOTLAND.

Gillon, W. D.	Oswald R. A.	Pringle, R.	Wallace, R.
Hay, Colonel L.	Oswald, J.	Stewart, R.	Wemyss, Captain
Oliphant, L.			

## IRELAND.

Blake, M. J.	O'Connell, D.	Ruthven, E. S.	Vigors, N. A.
Evans, G.	O'Connell, M.	Ruthven, E.	Walker, C. A.
Jacob, E.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Sheil, R. L.	

## PAIRED OFF.

Bainbridge, E. T.	Hall, B.	Lynch, A. H.	O'Connell, M.
Bowes, J.	Fleming, Adml.	Marjoribanks, S.	Palmer, General

TELLERS.—Hume, J.—Rippon C.

SHUT OUT.—Molesworth, Sir W.

## MINORITY of 61,

Tellers included, who on the 17th of March voted in favour of Mr. Cobbett's motion,  
 "That it is expedient that from and after the 5th of October next, all duties on malt shall cease and determine."

## ENGLAND.

Adams, E. H.	Crawley, S.	Leech, J.	Trelawney, W. L. S.
Aghouby, H. A.	Curteis, Captain	Lennard, Sir T.	Trevor, Hon. R.
Astley, Sir J.	Faithfull, G.	Lister, E. C.	Tyrell, Sir J.
Attwood, T.	Fancourt, Major	Mills, W.	Tyrell, C.
Barnard, J. G.	Fielden, J.	Parrott, J.	Vincent, Sir F.
Bell, M.	Foley, E.	Pigot, N.	Walter, J.
Bowes, J.	Folkes, Sir W.	Plumptre, J. P.	Wason, R.
Buckingham, J. S.	Gaskell, D.	Rickford, W.	Watkins, L.
Burton, H.	Hume, J.	Robinson, G. R.	Wigley, I. N.
Chandos, Marquis of Ingilby, Sir W.	Shawe, R. N.	Simeon, Sir R.	Wilks, J.
Chaplin, Colonel	James, W.		Winnington, H.
Clayton, Col. W. R. Koppel, Major			

## SCOTLAND.

Ferguson, Captain	Oswald, R. A.	Sinclair, G.	Wallace, R.
Maxwell, Sir J.			

## IRELAND.

Jacob, E.	O'Connell, Morgan	Ruthven, E. S.	Sheil, R. L.
O'Connell, M.	O'Connell, J.	Ruthven, E.	

TELLERS.—Cobbett, W.—Curteis, H. B.

PAIRED OFF.—Goring, H. D.—Tynte, C. J. K.

SHUT OUT.—Kennedy, K.

## SPEECH OF MR. RICHARDS, M. P. FOR KNARESBOROUGH, ON THE CORN LAWS.

In our last Number, page 252, we said—"Mr. F. O'Connor, Mr. Richards, and Mr. Heathcote, opposed any alteration whatever in the Corn Laws;" and having heard the speeches of each as they were delivered, that was our impression as to their general tenor and effect; while impression was confirmed by their voting against Mr. Hume's motion. We have received, however, a communication from Mr. Richards himself, in which he expresses a desire that we should correct this misconception, as it is likely to injure him with his constituents; and he authorizes us to say, that "he wishes to see the Corn Laws repealed; but he wishes, *before they are repealed*, to see a great reduction of taxation." And on looking through the hon. member's speech, a full report of which he has enclosed us, extracted from "The Mirror of Parliament,"

we perceive that he objects to the opening of our ports to foreign grain, on the ground that our agriculturists are so burdened that they could not maintain a competition with the foreigner in the article of corn, and that consequently "landlords and farmers would alike be ruined, farms would be deserted, thousands of agricultural labourers would be thrown out of employment; and the poor-rates would prodigiously increase, while the number of those that pay rates would diminish; discontent and disaffection would spread over the country, and neither property nor life be secure." He says also, "The natural state of the corn trade would be that of absolute and complete freedom; but it is little short of madness to expect the British farmer, loaded as he is with rates and taxes, to sell his grain at the same price as the foreigner." We trust that these extracts will make the honourable members sentiments clearly understood.

## MOTIONS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WE have entered on the Notice Books of the House of Commons, the two following motions, which it is our intention to bring forward on the days named: these being the earliest that afford the least prospect of being able to bring them on at any tolerably early hour.

1. To move for a Select Committee to inquire into the causes of the great increase of habitual Drunkenness among the labouring classes of the Kingdom, and to devise legislative preventatives against the further spread of this great national evil.—*Friday May 20.*

2. To move for leave to bring in a Bill to prevent the unchristian and barbarous practice of Duelling.—*Tuesday June 3.*

We make this announcement thus early, in order to afford an opportunity to all those of our readers who desire to promote the accomplishment of either or both of these objects, to obtain, in their respective towns and neighbourhoods, the expression of public opinion on their importance, either in the shape of public meetings, resolutions, or petitions, as well as evidence of the evils produced by the vices and practices here sought to be restrained and abolished.

For the first object, the Temperance Societies now established throughout the country, will afford the best organs of enquiry, of action, and of communication: and for the second, any cases of extreme injury inflicted on surviving families, by deaths occasioned through Duelling will be highly useful. The one is an evil prevalent chiefly among the humbler classes of society—the other is a stain confined almost exclusively to the upper classes of society. We desire to show no unnecessary tenderness to either, but to free both if possible from the two evils named: and shall accept with gratitude, any aid rendered through the press or any other channels to promote their abolition.

The two following Notices have been also entered for the dates given: and the only reason why they have not been brought forward earlier, was indisposition on the part of the mover during the earlier part of the session, and the pre-occupation of all the open days by other motions entered by other honourable members.

Mr. Buckingham,—Resolution, That it is expedient to reduce the Interest of the National Debt; and that, with a view of effecting this by such gradual diminution as may afford an annual relief to the country, without pressing too severely on individuals, it is desirable to convert all the existing varieties of the Public Funds into a single Five per Cent. Stock; such conversion to be made at the actual market price of each particular Stock, on the average of the last twelve months; the new Five per Cent. Stock to be made a terminable Annuity for one hundred years, commencing with the payment of five per cent. per annum in the first year, and diminishing the rate of interest annually by one shilling in each hundred pounds, till the whole shall become extinct.—*Tuesday, 10th June.*

Mr. Buckingham,—Bill to repeal so much of the Act 54 Geo. III., commonly called "The Copyright Act," as enjoins the delivery of eleven copies of every book and volume for the eleven public libraries therein mentioned, excepting only one copy to the British Museum.—*Tuesday, 17th June.*

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1834.

SIR JOHN CAMPBELL, HIS MAJESTY'S ATTORNEY-  
GENERAL, AND LATE M.P. FOR DUDLEY.

IN proceeding with our Series of Parliamentary Portraits, of which we have already given two, Mr. MACAULEY and Mr. SHELL, we desire to be understood as not following any particular order. We shall take individuals as the modern French dramatists seize on historic incidents, merely to suit our occasion; and our Portraits shall be to the full as much *Pieces de Circonstance* as the comedies of Monsieur Scribe.

The defeat of Sir John Campbell at Dudley possesses, however, a more than fugacious interest. It is a sign of the times which may not be mistaken. It is a solemn warning which no Ministry should misunderstand. If it be read rightly it may yet be turned to good account, but if it be disregarded it may be productive of remote consequences of which Ministers, in the blind confidence of an unreal security, may little dream. To what or to whom is this signal defeat to be attributed? Is it to the individual himself, or is it to the measures of the Ministers whom he serves? Dudley is a new Borough, created under the Reform Act, and Sir John Campbell, then Solicitor-General, contested it at the last General Election against Sir Horace St. Paul. The hon. baronet polled 229 votes, while his successful opponent, the worthy knight, polled no less than 318 out of a constituency of 800. In little more than a year all is changed. Sir John Campbell, on being appointed Attorney-General, lies to his constituents, amongst whom he had been well received during the summer: he is bold, confident, sure of success; when lo! a Conservative candidate appears, in the person of Mr. Hawkes, and beats the legal knight by a majority of 74!

It is our business to inquire into the causes of a revulsion so signal and so sudden. Some of these have doubtless had their origin in the arrogant and unpopular manner of the Attorney-General; but the main reasons lie in the public conduct of the legal functionary, and in the timidity and weakness of the Ministers whom he serves. It no doubt ill becomes a man sprung from the very loins of the people to play the magnifico; more especially when he cannot do so naturally or with a good grace; but we think these foolish airs would pass un-

heeded if they were not accompanied by public and official acts which offend the whole nation.

The prosecutions of the Press, of which the King's Bench and Common Pleas have recently been the theatre, and wherein Sir John Campbell has played a part so conspicuously discreditable, have not been forgotten at Dudley, and the result of the late contest sufficiently proves that they have not been forgiven. To have framed the Indictment, and to have advised on Evidence, would have in all conscience—at least for a man so long connected with the Periodical Press as Sir John Campbell—have been bad enough!—but to have displayed so much impatient eagerness before the Jury for a conviction—to have stormed, and fumed, and threatened, as the late Solicitor-General had done—was, to say the least of it, indiscreet—and we think it may be pronounced to have given the finishing blow to his pretensions on the freemen of Dudley. The unpopularity of the Ministry is, however, the great *remora* upon their servants. Their conduct on Mr. Harvey's motion on the Pension List—at once weak, vacillating, and disingenuous—their treatment of Mr. Sheil—the feeble and inefficient Relief proffered to the Dissenters—the promotion of the Crolys and Gliggs by the Lord Chancellor—while hundreds of Whig Clergymen are pining in unmerited want and hopeless expectation—the employment at the Bar of persons of notoriously Tory opinions—and the nomination on numerous Commissions of men of no fixed principles at all, and who would betray the Whigs to-morrow if they were out of place—these are the weak doings of half-demented men, who have had the infelicitous renown of at once emboldening their enemies and disgusting their friends.

The people know well that it is impossible to separate an Attorney-General from the Cabinet which he serves, even though, individually, he were without blemish; and hence Sir John Campbell has been made an example of, chiefly, for the grievous faults of the Ministry, and not a little for his own more recent unpopular acts and haughty bearing. So much was necessary, generally, by way of preface on a subject of passing interest; nor are these observations devoid of aptness in discussing the public and political character of Sir John Campbell.

The subject of this sketch is a native of North Britain. He was born somewhere about the year 1778, and is consequently in his fifty-sixth year. His father was one of the ill paid and hardly worked clergy of the Kirk of Scotland. From his parent he received the first rudiments of education. He was afterwards sent to one of those grammar-schools with which all parts of Scotland abounds, and after receiving instruction therein for some years, it was necessary that he should turn his thoughts to some mode of obtaining an honest subsistence. With our brethren north of the Tweed, this is a matter of little or no difficulty; for at home or abroad they are sure to find some niche for their reception.

The embryo Attorney-General was endowed with all the characteristics with which “the thrifty genius of the Tweed fortifies her children.” Frugal, hardy, industrious, and persevering, with few wants and practised self-denial, he set out for the great mart of human subsistence, London. He arrived in the metropolis somewhere about the year

1797-8, being then in his nineteenth or twentieth year. The "world was all before him where to choose," and with the ready instinct of a North Briton, he knocked at the door of his successful compatriot, James Perry, then Proprietor and Editor of the *Morning Chronicle*.

Mr. Perry was in some sort a remarkable man. He too was a native of Aberdeen, and had by patient labour, and persevering industry, risen not only to affluence, but to what in his case might be called distinction. He was received at the tables of the great Whig families, and made the depository of most of their party secrets. He proved himself in every way worthy of this confidence. During a long life he betrayed no trust; he violated no confidence. He died as he had lived, honoured by his friends, and respected by his political enemies; for social enemies he had none.

Six-and-thirty years ago the *Morning Chronicle* was as unlike as possible to the print which now bears that name. It was then the recognized and accredited organ of the great Whig party, a party distinguished by high rank, great wealth, much Parliamentary influence, and still greater Parliamentary talent. Its circulation was immense—its expenditure large, and the profits proportionate. We have heard the net gains of the proprietor mentioned as at least amounting to 12,000*l.* a-year. It is not surprising that the head of such an establishment should have numerous employments to bestow. Many Scotchmen rose to eminence by means of a connexion with James Perry. It was in the *Morning Chronicle* that Doctor, afterwards Sir James Mackintosh, first became known as a writer.—It was as a Reporter for the *Morning Chronicle* that Mr., now Serjeant Spankie, worked his way to the Bar, and it was as Parliamentary Reporter too, that Mr., now Sir John Campbell, his Majesty's Attorney-General, first made his *debut* in the House of Commons. For five or six years Mr. Campbell continued this occupation. He was remarkable for industry, frugality, and general good conduct. In 1802 he entered himself of Lincoln's Inn, and in 1803-4, at the request, and by the pecuniary assistance of Mr. Perry (who had observed his merit, and wished to contribute to forward his fortunes), he became a pupil of Mr. Tidd's. There was in the same year a fellow Reporter of Mr. Campbell's, to whom Mr. Perry, with great good nature, made a similar proposition; but this eccentric and highly-gifted man declined the offer of his generous patron. Mr. Peter Finnerty (for it is to him we allude) had most of the virtues and many of the vices of his countrymen. Ardent, enthusiastic, unthinking, he entered into the Society of United Irishmen, and became a martyr in the cause of his country. As the Editor or Printer of the newspaper called *The Press*, he was prosecuted for libel, and stood in the Pillory. Shortly after he emigrated to Great Britain, and was engaged as a Reporter on the *Morning Chronicle*. Perry perceiving that this man possessed a masculine mind, and a clear and logical head, conceived the idea of paying his expenses to the Bar, and starting him into life at the same period as Campbell, but the Irishman, in one of those fitful moments, whether of caprice or waywardness, to which the natives of his country are so prone, instantaneously rejected the offer. The result was, as might have been expected. The one a man of very ordinary capacity, of neither wit or eloquence, or fancy, or learning, but endowed with what Burns (who



was devoid of it) calls the root of wisdom—namely, “a prudent, cautious self-control”—and that native shrewdness and sagacity, which appear to be inseparable from the nature of a Scotchman—became an eminent lawyer, receiving a large, annual income—while the other, a man of far higher powers of mind—and a much more masculine understanding—but with no touch of prudence or perseverance, continued the laborious drudgery of a Reporter to the last, and died in comparative indigence, in 1821. Here is an exemplification of the qualities necessary to success in human life. It is not talent, it is not genius that ensure wealth and prosperity, but laborious perseverance, and unity, and directness of purpose, towards the one thing needful. He who desires to compass these ends must

“Scorn delights and live laborious days.”

In Michaelmas Term, 1806, or in Hilary, 1807, Mr. Campbell was called to the Bar. He was not long idle; for in Michaelmas Term, 1807, he commenced his Reports of Cases, argued and tried at Nisi Prius, in the Courts of King’s Bench and Common Pleas. These Reports were continued to the sittings before Easter, 1811, inclusive, and were distinguished by great accuracy and considerable legal knowledge. They acquired a reputation which Nisi Prius Reports rarely attain, and are to this day quoted as standard works. They differ from all other Reports in this—that Mr. Campbell not only introduced the name of the Counsel, but of the Solicitors also. There were people ill-natured enough to say—and perhaps to say truly—that this departure from the general rule was made with a view to conciliate the Solicitors. All that is certain is, that it was a rule not adopted before or since, and it certainly had the effect of procuring Mr. Campbell business. At this period, 1807, the present Attorney-General was dependant on his daily labour for his daily bread. He lived in small and humble chambers at the Temple, and the writer of this Sketch has heard from the late Mr. William Cowley (a gentleman who went the Home Circuit, on which Mr. Campbell then travelled, though he afterwards left it for the Oxford), that nothing could be more exemplary than the conduct and demeanor of the then briefless “utter Barrister.”

The attorneys were not slow in making an acquaintance with an individual who had first recorded their names in his Reports. They gave him some little business, and the practical part of this was conducted so much to their satisfaction, that they recurred again and again to so pains-taking and industrious a junior. For fourteen or fifteen years Mr. Campbell plodded “his weary way” to independence, never turning from the bye-path of his profession into the high road of Politics. To toil after him in this useful but laborious course would not be pleasant to ourselves, and it could hardly fail to be uninteresting to our readers, more especially as Mr. Campbell was rarely if ever employed in any questions excepting those of practice. Occasionally he made arguments in Banco, and exhibited a rare acquaintance with “Case Law;” but he was never known to enunciate a general principle, or to adorn his efforts with the adventitious ornaments derived from history, literature, or general criticism. To taste or eloquence he did not aspire, his great and only aim being proficiency in his profession.

Towards 1819 or 20, Sir John proposed himself as the husband of Mr. now Sir James Scarlett's daughter. At that period the proposal was not accepted, though they were subsequently married about the year 1822. Meantime Mr. Campbell had acquired considerable property, and it is understood he made a large settlement on his lady previously to their union.

The retirement of Messrs. Marryat and Reader from the Bar, a couple of years afterwards, opened a wider field to Mr. Campbell. His business increased in amount as well as in importance; and in 1826-7 he might be pronounced to divide the first briefs on the Oxford Circuit with the late Mr. Serjeant Russell, who afterwards died a Judge in Bengal. His successes on Circuit as well as in town, were wholly owing to his knowledge of Law, for never was there a feebler Advocate before Court or Jury. Yet such is the blindness of self-love, that Mr. Campbell has always considered himself as one of the first forensic speakers of the day. No one will deny to him the praise of being perhaps the second-best Common Law Lawyer in Great Britain; but at the same time it must be allowed that he is the heaviest and most tedious speaker that ever opened his mouth in a court of justice. He evidently strains to adopt his father-in-law's style as a model in addressing Juries—but the attempt is a miserable failure. The Attorney-General has all the shrewdness and sagacity of Sir James—he is perhaps fully equal to him in knowledge of law—but he wants his quickness—and that subtlety, finesse, and knowledge of mankind, in which Sir James Scarlett is so great a master. He wants, moreover, the general knowledge and learning, and the varied classic attainments of the Ex-Attorney General. There is no man at the Bar or elsewhere whose mind is more deeply imbued with classic literature than that of the honourable and learned Member for Norwich; while it is notorious that there is no man in the three kingdoms whose knowledge is more entirely confined to his profession than Sir John Campbell. A ludicrous instance of this occurred some six or seven years ago in the Court of King's Bench. "Repeat to me," said the Knight to a witness, "the first lines of Virgil." The young man in the box was commencing accordingly with his *Arma virumque*, when Sir John Campbell interposed with an ejaculation of surprise, exclaiming—"These the first lines! No, Sir—"

Infandum Regina jubes renovare dolorem.

It is needless to say that the Bench, the Bar, the Jury, and such of the auditors as had been to school were convulsed with laughter. Yet the man who had committed this egregious mistake was perhaps the soundest lawyer in the whole court.

When the Common Law Commissioners were instituted by Parliament, Sir John Campbell was one of the individuals appointed as commissioner. It were superfluous to say that he performed his duties with ability and discretion.

At the general election in 1830, he was first returned for Stafford. The Duke of Wellington was then in power, and the father-in-law of Sir John Campbell was his Attorney-General. It was generally supposed that the member for Stafford would support Ministers, though earlier in life he had professed himself a Whig, and became a member of Brookes's Club; but for a long period he had ceased to attend

there, and it was very generally understood among his friends that he would not be a martyr to political opinions of any cast or complexion. We believe the Duke of Wellington's government calculated on his support on general questions, and we have heard it asserted for certain, that it was a mere matter of chance that he did not vote with them against Sir Henry Parnell's motion which drove the Wellington government from office. On that memorable occasion he happened to be absent from the division, and if what we have heard asserted by well-informed persons be true—namely, that Sir John was disposed to vote with the minority—it is as well for his fame as for his political fortunes that he was absent. It is certain that for some time after the installation of the Whig government the hon. and learned member for Stafford was looked on rather coldly by the Government, though he uniformly voted and sometimes spoke in their favour. His addresses to the House were poor and meagre performances—entirely passionless, and without one touch of fire or vigour. His views were sensible rather than profound or capacious, and he disclosed them in a loose and common-place verbiage, alike devoid of elegance, point, and nerve. Moderation of tone and manner—practised shrewdness—and good sense seemed to be the only prominent features in the few observations he let fall in the House. There was no attempt at historical learning—no effort at illustration—you saw before you a plain spoken shrewd-minded lawyer—who treated all questions in a business-like way, and with a strict reference to the question of profit and loss. It ill became a man of his safe species of mediocrity of mind to venture beyond his depth; and still less to speak as though he were a “Sir Oracle”—but the habit of confidence acquired at the bar led Sir John Campbell sometimes into this fault, though he was generally reprov'd for this temerity in the way in which presumption is treated among well informed gentlemen. He would have met perhaps a severer rebuke at the weekly meeting of any Trades' Club, or Mechanics' Institute throughout the country, for even these humble men are greatly above the average standard of the “*leguleius quidam*”—the mere “*Cantor Formarum*,” who is only skilled in the points of practice of the Pleas or Bench. Apart from these defects Sir John's senatorial career is without stain if it be without brilliancy.

At the general election in 1831, Sir John Campbell was a second time returned for Stafford. At this period his name became associated with some useful projects of law reform, which though unopposed by the Government were nevertheless not supported by them as cabinet measures.

We are now arrived at the period when death put an end to the useful labours of Lord Tenterden. The vacancy created by the death of this able lawyer was filled by the promotion of Sir Thomas Denman. Sir William Horne was thereupon created Attorney General, and after some short interval of delay Mr. Campbell was made Solicitor General. He explained his principles to the electors of Dudley, in a sensible and manly address, and was triumphantly returned by them. We are bound to allow—and we make the admission very willingly—that Sir John's efforts to improve and simplify the Common Law were worthy of all praise, and we are equally ready to admit that his act for the amendment of the law of inheritance—though not without faults—is

as far as it goes, a step in the march of improvement. There can be but one opinion as to his efforts to abolish the law of arrest for debt; and he should also have his share of credit for the valuable suggestions contained in the Report of the Common Law Commissioners. So far all is praiseworthy, but the bearing of the Solicitor General in the case of the prosecution of the *True Sun* was arrogant; and for a man who had risen to fame by means of a profitable connexion with newspapers unseemly. His conduct to the jury (every man of whom it is likely possessed on every subject but law twenty times his average of general knowledge), was insolent and overbearing; and we are convinced that it had no ordinary effect on his constituents at Dudley. As we are observing on this subject, we may once for all, remark, that the ex-member for Dudley loses his wanted sagaciousness and good sense in his addresses to juries. His manners are pert and pragmatical; you perceive the "*novus homo*" in each word and movement. This offensiveness has made him many enemies in his own profession, and still more out of it; and when the intellectual stature of the man is considered (for though in law a giant, in every thing else he is much below the ordinary stature), it is the more indefensible.

On the whole, Sir John Campbell may be pronounced a safe guide in professional matters for any Ministry with whom he is connected. He is a clear-headed, strong-minded man of moderate opinions; and thoroughly learned in his own profession.

As an advocate he is miserable indeed. He can acquire no ascendancy over the minds of his fellow men. He has none of the "*perfervidium ingenium Scotorum*." His very blood is cold and torpid, and seems to flow sluggishly through the muddy channel of his veins. Byron's description of a living legal functionary is strictly applicable to him:—

"The cheek of parchment and the eye of stone."

And art has done nothing to overcome these signal natural disadvantages.

The loss of Sir John Campbell's services as a debater may therefore be esteemed "at the twentieth part of one poor scruple," nay, at the Hanneman\* proportion of a grain.

In the chamber and in council he can still do his patrons infinite service, and if he be not bitten—which by the bye we are told he is—by the mad fancy of looking to preside in a court of equity, he may yet have the merit of getting the Whigs out of many of the scrapes into which their weakness continually leads them headlong.

#### DUTIES OF A MARITIME NATION.

WHEN we consider that our very strength and consequence as a Nation stands upon our being a commercial people, it is evidently our highest wisdom to pay every attention to maritime affairs. To improve our harbours, make our rivers navigable, and to open communications by means of canals, are works becoming the genius of an enlightened people, and a certain source of wealth and prosperity. *Dodd.*

\* Our readers may have heard of the infinitesimal proportions in which this celebrated inventor of the Homopathic system measures out his nostrums.

## THE THREE MORNINGS' DEBATE—ON FREE TRADE AND THE CORN LAWS.

THE Morning Sittings were instituted for the purpose of clearing off the petitions, and leaving the evening free for the discussion of motions submitted to the House and intended to be pressed to divisions, and for the progress of measures, sanctioned by the House, and passing through their several stages towards their completion. During the last session we expressed our doubts as to its answering this purpose, and these doubts have been confirmed by the proceedings of the present session. Not a day passes without ten or twenty petitions arriving in London, to be presented by different members, on various subjects, so that every week there are from fifty to one hundred petitions accumulated at least. Now, in the two mornings' debate on the London Petition for a revision of the New Tea Duties, and the three mornings' debate on the Liverpool Petition for a Free Trade in all articles of food, beginning with corn—an entire week has been occupied; and all petitions received during that week, as well as all the arrears standing over from the preceding weeks, have been, of course entirely suspended. We confess, that we do not think this useful, or fair. If any great public question is intended to be *discussed*, it ought to be done on a resolution to be proposed, or a committee to be moved for, or a bill to be brought in, after due notice, and on a fixed day, and at a time when the greatest number of members usually attend; so that, *after* the discussion, the sense of the House might be taken on the subject, and the motion, or committee, or bill, be adopted or rejected, as the division might determine. This was done with the Corn Laws, the Malt-Tax, the Pension List, the Bishops, the Impressment of Seamen, Flogging in the Army, and other public questions; and this ought undoubtedly to be done with such important subjects as the Tea Duties, affecting a revenue of four millions sterling, and with Free Trade, affecting the interests of every class of the community. But instead of this, a petition is presented on each subject, and after two days' discussion on the one, and three days' discussion on the other, the only question moved is, "that the petitions do lie upon the table," so that not a single step is gained in advance for either. Our own impression was at the first, and every day's experience has strengthened it, that no extension of the *time* for debating will expedite, but rather retard, the public business. We believe that if the House were to meet at eight in the morning, and continue till twelve at night, there would always be found persons to fill up the full measure of the time by speaking, and that no question would even then be disposed of without many still wishing to speak upon it who had not an opportunity of being heard; for the more time that is given for talking, the greater the number of talkers who will appear; and as every new speaker furnishes new matter for comment or reply to those who follow after, the evil is

accumulative, and goes on, *not* decreasing, as might be supposed, in proportion to the number who speak, but absolutely increasing in the exact ratio of that number; for, to every one who addresses the House on either side of any question, there are at least two on the other side who are anxious to reply to him. It is really high time, therefore, that some limit should be put to this:—by limiting the number of hours during which the House shall sit eight hours in each day, from ten till six o'clock, would be abundant: with intervening days for petitions, private bills, and committees;—by limiting the extent of time for speeches, one hour for the opener of any motion, and half an hour for every one else, would be ample; and by limiting the number of motions that any one Member should bring on during a Session, of which half-a-dozen would be a full allowance. But every thing else being unlimited, the talking is unlimited also; and therefore it is, that in every succeeding year an immense quantity of time is wasted and lost in the early part of the Session; and then towards its close, every thing is hurried through in such a manner as to prevent the possibility of due care and investigation. We rejoice to find that Colonel Davies has obtained a Committee to consider of the best mode of expediting the Business of the House, of which Committee we are named a Member; and we can pledge ourselves that all these inconveniencies shall be laid before that Committee, with such remedies as the case requires, whether they may be adopted by the majority or not.

The discussion on the Liverpool Petition was commenced on Wednesday the 19th by Mr. Ewart, the Member for that town, whose speech embodies the subject of its prayer so fully and so accurately that we give it entire.

Mr. EWART felt great pleasure in presenting a petition with which he had been intrusted from the inhabitants of Liverpool and its vicinity, in favour of free trade, commencing with a free trade in corn, because a similar feeling had exhibited itself in many of the other great towns in the kingdom, and more particularly as he beheld an expression of the same opinion in France, by the simultaneous presentation of a petition of the same kind to the Chamber of Deputies from the great commercial town of Bordeaux. The petitioners stated that among the permanent and substantial benefits anticipated from a reform in the representation of the people, they had ever considered that a free and unrestricted commerce would occupy a prominent place, as providing the best means of increasing the comforts of the people, and the only means of enabling the country to sustain the burden of an enormous taxation. To a manufacturing nation a free trade in corn was of the most vital importance, as affecting immediately and directly the great body of the people, and comprehending within itself the unlimited extension of almost every branch of commerce and manufactures; inasmuch as the markets of the world would be open to the products of the skill and industry of Great Britain, if the people of Great Britain would accept in return those products of the soil of other nations which alone they had to offer in exchange. They considered a legislative prohibition on the import of food as an infringement of the inalienable rights of a free people—a violation of principle so gross, that it had been found impossible to carry it into complete operation; and a palliation of the evil had therefore been sought in a periodical expatriation of the people; by such a process attempting, though in vain, to realize the costly absurdity of sending forth the nation to seek food, instead of bringing food to the nation. They considered it the bounden duty of Government to grant to their subjects the fullest scope for the exercise of those energies and capabilities with which Providence has endowed them, for which the world at large was the only sufficient theatre, and of which they cannot be deprived except by an act of deliberate and undeniable oppression. They could not admit the plea of fiscal or financial

regulations as a barrier to their indefeasible rights, because those regulations should ever be so ordered as to be made subservient to the great principles of justice and of public good. They therefore prayed for an unrestricted commerce in every article of import and export, subject only to such moderate duties as the exigencies of the revenue, and a strict and impartial consideration of all classes of the people, might demand; and, subject alone to this consideration, they most especially prayed for an unrestricted trade in corn, and in every article constituting the food of man. He trusted the time was approaching when reason and experience would convince the agricultural interest that it was only by sound principles their prosperity could be maintained. If they consulted their real interest, they would see that the present was the time for carrying the arrangement proposed by the petitioners into effect. He could assure the house that if they were blind to their own interests, the philosophers and political economists of Germany and other continental nations were not; and if this country continued to defend itself by restrictions, Prussia and Germany would adopt the same course, and the consequence would be that the *vis inertiae* of those intelligent nations would be aroused, and they would become our most formidable rivals. Germany was about to unite herself in one great confederacy against this country, so that if there ever was a period at which the house ought to consider how British manufactures could be extended, it was now. He hoped the voice of the people would be united to that of the most intelligent men of the country in the endeavour to shake off those baneful restrictions that cramped her commercial freedom. (Hear.)

Mr. Brotherton seconded the Petition; Mr. Cayley opposed its doctrines, and Mr. Roebuck defended them; and in the course of his speech said, the question was so simple that any man of common sense could state it in five minutes. Sir Robert Peel, who followed Mr. Roebuck, was the great opponent of the Free Trade system during this morning's debate, and, in fairness, we give also his speech entire.

Sir R. PEEL said that the hon. member who had last addressed the house declared that the question might be stated in five minutes; but although he had occupied a much longer period, he had not referred to one of the elements of the case contained in the petition. (Hear.) It was not necessary for him to state the number and importance of each of the elements composing that great question of the corn laws,—he would only refer to one—the relation of this country with Ireland. (Hear.) •The hon. member had not considered the charge to which the land was subject; he had omitted altogether the mention of the malt-tax (hear, hear), the land-tax, the tax by the tithe (for it had been admitted by our political economists to be a tax on the land), besides several other local charges. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. baronet then read a statement of the charges which existed upon land in the year 1823, from certain official returns, which showed that a vast amount was levied upon land, while a very small proportionate sum was paid upon houses and manufacturing premises. He would put it to the house whether it was not the policy of the Legislature to support the landed interest, and the cultivator of the soil; and he must say that a great endeavour had been made against that interest, by representing the landowner as being actuated by a desire to support a monopoly for the augmentation of his wealth. (Hear, Hear.) He did not hesitate to say that if there was a free trade in corn, the land would be no longer able to bear the burdens with which it was at present charged. (Hear.) There must at least be a different appropriation of the poor-rates and the country-rates. He was desirous of saying a few words upon the term "monopoly," which was so frequently applied to the corn-laws. He observed that the petitioners did not confine themselves to a free trade in corn, but advocated the principle generally, and he could easily understand why it was the inhabitants of the port of Liverpool were desirous to witness the destruction of all monopolies (hear); but did the manufacturers in the large inland towns join in the prayer? (Hear.) The manufacturers would be happy to witness a free trade in corn, but he doubted whether they would agree with the petitioners upon the application of the principle to articles of manufac-

ture. (Hear, hear.) It was easy to show that the monopoly with which the agriculturist had been taunted was only that sort of protection which was afforded to almost every article of British manufacture, by the imposition of a duty on the importation of articles manufactured abroad. He had made a careful selection of every necessary of dress, as well as many conveniences and luxuries, and found that they all bore a duty for the protection of the British manufacturer. If the agriculturist was inclined to purchase articles of foreign manufacture, he would find, in addition to the price of the article itself, the following duties imposed :— Upon his hat there was a tax of 10s. 6d., to protect the British manufacturer. (Hear.) Upon his linen there was a duty of 40 per cent. ; upon his woollen 20 per cent. ; and, if he wore a silk hat, he had to pay a duty of 1l. 5s. (Hear.) If his wife wished to wear a silk gown of foreign manufacture, she must pay a duty of 2l. 10s. ; upon gloves 5s. per dozen was imposed ; upon porcelain, 30 per cent. ; upon glass, 20 per cent. ; and upon gold plate 3l. 16s. 9d. per ounce. Even his walking-stick was taxed ; if it was the plain production, it paid 5s. a thousand, but if the stick was mounted, painted, or otherwise ornamented, it paid a duty of 20 per cent. (Hear, and a laugh.) So that in every case in which the English manufacturer could be affected by the import a tax was imposed for his protection. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. baronet quoted many other articles subject to a tax upon their importation into this country, and contended that the manufacturer in this country enjoyed the protection of these duties against the foreigner, and that the corn-laws were only a similar protection upon the farmer. (Hear, hear.) It was therefore very unjustly denominated a monopoly. (Hear.)

The hour of three o'clock having arrived, Sir Robert Peel was cut short in his speech by the Speaker's leaving the chair, so that the debate stood adjourned until the following morning as a matter of course. The speakers on Thursday were, Sir Henry Parnell, Colonel Torrens, and Sir George Strickland, in favour of the views of the petitioners ; and Mr. Finch, Mr. Childers, Mr. Langdale, Sir Charles Burrell, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robinson, Sir Harry Verney, and Lord Sandon against them. The two most important speeches on either side were those of Mr. Finch, against, and Sir Henry Parnell for, the doctrines set forth in the petition, and we balance these against each other, by giving both entire.

Mr. FINCH declared himself opposed to any alteration in the present system of corn laws. If, however, it should be found the best line of policy that a repeal should take place, he thought the petitioners had selected the most improper of all periods for carrying that object into effect. The agricultural interest was now in a state of the greatest depression ; and as a repeal of the Corn Laws could not be effected without inflicting very considerable injury upon the farmer, it would have been much wiser in the petitioners to have permitted the present state of depression to pass by, and to have waited at least until a few prosperous seasons had better fitted the agricultural interest for a change, which would at any period be attended with considerable loss. He did not think the distress in the agricultural districts arose from the operation of the Corn Laws, but from a combination of causes that were not all of them to be very easily traced. He was glad to find a disposition in the petitioners to bring the whole question before the house, and not to confine themselves to a free trade in corn alone, and he hoped the discussion would be of the same manly character, and that the question of free trade would not be tied down merely to the Corn Laws. The whole question of free trade was a great chimera. He believed, if the golden age could be revived, free trade might be employed ; but before that could take place we must have a season of uninterrupted peace ; for if a war should happen to break out, great losses must necessarily accrue to the farmer by driving trade into its old channels. The abolition of the Corn Laws would lead to a total revolution in the social, manufacturing, agricultural, commercial, and financial arrangements of the country, and in all probability result in her downfall. (Hear.) Trade could only be reduced to a state of perfect freedom by an overwhelming tax upon capital ; public credit



would fall; and although it might be an amusing sight to see a Chancellor of the Exchequer weeping over the loss of his budget, or form a ludicrous caricature in the print shops to see a picture entitled "Chancellor of the Exchequer wot lost his budget," yet it would be attended with ruin to the country. The race in his opinion was not between the manufacturer and the agriculturist of this country, but between the agriculturist of England and the agriculturist of Poland. The hon. member for London, who had voted against free trade, objected to a free trade even between different parts of the empire, on the ground that it would interfere with the chartered rights of the city of London. He (Mr. Finch), however, did not oppose the principle on such a contracted ground, for he should be friendly to not only a free trade between England and Scotland, and England and Ireland, but between every place within the bounds of the kingdom. He looked at the question in a more extended view, and considering that it would not only affect every class in this country, but also the interests of the East and West Indies, he felt bound to give all the opposition in his power to so violent and injurious a principle.

Sir H. PARNELL said that having a petition to present upon this subject, he trusted the house would permit him to make a few observations upon the question. The hon. member who last addressed the house grounded his case upon the interest the farmer had in this question. Now, whenever such a position was stated in that house, he felt it to be his duty to contradict it in the most direct and positive manner. (Hear.) It was a gross delusion practised upon the farmer by the landlords, to say that they, the farmers, were interested in the continuance of the present system of Corn Laws. (Hear, hear.) Let the question be fully and fairly discussed, and let the farmer really understand his own interest, and he would undertake to say that it would be impossible to maintain the doctrine that the two interests were identical, and it would be equally impossible that the monopoly of the Corn Laws could any longer exist. (Hear, hear.) The farmer was a person who had to obtain his livelihood by the application of his capital in a particular pursuit—the tillage of land, for instance; his interest, therefore, depended upon the rate of return rendered by his capital, which again depended upon the price of the produce of the land with reference to the rent. If the price fell, or, in other words, if it were reduced by the repeal of the Corn Laws, the interest of the farmer must be put to rights, and his losses prevented, by a reduction in the rate of rent. (Hear, hear.) When it was clearly proved that the interest of the farmer depended upon the price of the produce of the land with reference to rent, the farmer must be satisfied that he had no interest in the monopoly of the Corn Laws, but that the landlord had. (Hear, hear.) The whole community, in fact, was taxed by the Corn Laws, for the purpose only of increasing the rent of the landlord. (Hear.) It had been stated that 12,000,000 of individuals were interested in the question; but that was a most erroneous argument, inasmuch as only a few hundred thousand landlords were really benefitted by the Corn Laws. If landlords were to receive less than they now received by 500,000*l.* or 1,000,000*l.* a-year in consequence of the Corn Laws, that money would remain in the pockets of the consumer; the actual income of the country would not be interfered with, although landlords would have less, but the money being in the pockets of the consumer, it would pay as much tax, employ as much labour, and do as much, or even more, good than even if it were in the pockets of the landlord. (Hear.) With regard to the evils apprehended from a repeal of the Corn Laws, he believed they had really no foundation in fact. (Hear, hear.) As to the excessive taxation of the landlord, he believed it was greatly exaggerated. The malt-tax had been said to be a tax on the land, but he denied that it was. He would ask who paid it? (Hear.) The landlord paid very little, for it fell upon the great mass of the community. As to the county and highway rates, though they fell on the land, they were expended in the improvement of the land—such as making roads, &c., from all of which the landlords benefited. (Hear, hear.) Now with regard to the poor-rates, the landlords complained of their excess, but it should be known how much the landlords might have done if they had endeavoured in time to prevent the abuse of the poor-laws. (Hear, hear.) Neither did he agree in the supposed injurious effect which the abolition of the Corn Laws would have on our manufactures. The protection of a tax upon our imports ought

to be discontinued; it was an useless protection, and<sup>r</sup> productive of mischief. The 40 or 50 per cent. imposed upon articles of manufacture imported into this country was, in fact, a dead letter. (Hear.) His constituents, who were great manufacturers of linen, and knew their own interest as well as others, would be glad to see the protection on that article thrown away. All the arguments upon that subject were entirely useless. The whole question was involved in one principle, and the great evil was that under the peculiar circumstances of the country, there was an enormous quantity of capital unemployed, and a superabundance of labour. That capital and that labour wanted employment, and the house ought to endeavour to remove all the impediments which prevented their employment. (Hear, hear.) In proportion then to the reduction in price would be the increase of consumption and the employment of capital. The Corn Laws stood first in the way, and he should be glad to see that impediment first removed. (Cheers.)

The third day's debate was resumed on the morning sitting of Friday, by Mr. O'Reilly, who spoke against any alteration in the Corn Laws; and Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Lambert, Sir John Tyrrell, Mr. Walker, and Mr. Pease, followed on the same side. The speakers in favour of such alteration, were Mr. Harvey, Mr. Baines, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. T. Attwood, and Mr. O'Connell. Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Lambert, and Mr. Attwood, thought the change in the currency, and the weight of the debt greatly injurious to the landed interest, and advocated either a revision of the one, or an adjustment of the other, as essential to its relief. Mr. Harvey made an admirable speech on the question, in the course of which he gave utterance to some bold and important truths. We cannot insert the whole, but the two extracts which we subjoin will show the general character of the speech.

No mistake could be greater than to suppose that the interests of the tenants and the landlords were the same, for they were diametrically opposed to each other. The landlords had had their day of prosperity—their Pitt, and church and state system; but the day of retribution was now at hand. It was idle for them, now that they were called upon to pay, to say that if they suffered the fundholder would not be paid. If the landowners were all swept away to-morrow, it would be nothing to the fundholders unless they could carry the land with them. Let them not receive a farthing of rent, the fundholder, the creditor of the country, who had lent the country money in its time of need, would not be the worse off. (Hear, hear.) Every acre of land in this kingdom, everything above and below it, the mines, the forests, were all mortgaged to the public creditor; and when the landowner could no longer pay the interest of the mortgage the fundowner would be in the position of a private mortgagee; he would walk in and the landlord walk out. I repeat that every acre of land in this country is mortgaged to the fundholder, and to that, as a Liberal or Radical, if they pleased, I would keep them. The Radicals were constantly taunted with wanting to rob the fundholder, to shrink from the payment of that debt, which was contracted with their eyes open, for what gentlemen on the opposite side contended were great national advantages; but I am not one of those, and would maintain that when it should appear that the interest of the debt could not be paid—that was, 30 millions a-year could not be paid—they must let those who advanced the principal money into possession, unless they could do what it was for them to propose, and which I think it would be wise in the fundholders to accept, viz. come to an equitable adjustment. (Loud laughter.) Gentlemen seem to start with the bare idea of national insolvency; but did none of them ever hear of private insolvency? My professional experience has supplied many instances, and I have often smiled at the shifts and vagaries which the pride of debtors suggest; but reflection soon tells them that a speedy settlement is the most satisfactory, and I would appeal to the merchants and tradesmen around me, whether, in these days of declining business, a dividend of 10s. in the pound is not considered a very handsome composition. (“Hear, hear,” and laughter.) To be sure it would be a motley and

mighty meeting to see 280,000 dowagers and housemaids, peers and benefit societies, men and minors, of all ages and countries, brought together to take into consideration the amount of a great national debt. I should like to be present to watch the faces of the opposite parties. I wonder who would first break silence. (Loud laughter.) However, this and all such matters will be easily arranged. At present the suggestion is novel—but these discussions will work marvellously. (Hear.) They would have the effect of opening the eyes of the people to their true condition.

Before I sit down, I may be allowed to say a few words as to the landlords, and the effects of a free trade upon them. For the man of a moderate income—those whose estates varied from 500*l.* to 2,000*l.*—great suffering was at hand, especially where the income was largely anticipated by incumbrances; but the man of a mighty income—those who had 100,000*l.* a-year—would be able to weather the storm, if he could condescend to live upon half that amount. Men must adapt themselves to events which their madness had made inevitable. (Hear, hear.) It was no use to deny it. The lords of the soil had had their day. For more than thirty years they triumphed over and trampled upon every body, and every thing, and they must be prepared for that day of retribution, which, in this world, as well as the next, awaits him who does wrong. In my humble judgment the reckoning is not distant. (Hear, hear.)

The discussion becoming more and more tedious, and the patience of the House being quite exhausted, Mr. Ewart at length rose to reply—

Mr. EWART, in reply, said he would promise two things—first, that he would not speak five minutes; next, that he would confine himself closely to the point. He must begin by thanking the right hon. baronet (Sir R. Peel), for having virtually supported the petition from Liverpool. The whole tendency of the right hon. baronet's arguments merely went to show that other monopolists existed, as well as landed monopolists. He had proved, not that they were not monopolists, but that they were not the only monopolists. The Liverpool petition prayed for relief from monopolies generally, as well as for especial relief from a monopoly of the supply of food. The general principle, therefore, of the right hon. baronet's speech was favourable to the case of the petitioners rather than to the landed interest. But besides, he apprehended that the right hon. baronet had erred in detail. In the table of duties to which the right hon. baronet referred, the number of items was 1149. Of these about 800 were for food and raw materials, intended either for purposes of revenue, or for the protection of the landed interest. Of the 349 remaining items, 58 were for distinct manufactured articles (the rest being varying duties on the same kind of article.) Of these 58 items the greater part were not protections of British industry. In the staple articles of cotton, wool, silk, and iron, we wanted no protection. The rest might be consolidated in one term, which he (Mr. Ewart) would borrow from the right hon. baronet, and call "the walking-stick interests." The hon. member for Beverley had said, "By altering the corn law you will not diminish our burdens, you only shift them." The advocates of repeal answered, "We may not lessen your burden, but we may increase your power of bearing it; we may not at once reduce your debt, but we may better enable you to pay it!" With respect to the other arguments advanced on behalf (as it was erroneously said) of the landed interest, he (Mr. Ewart) would adopt a quotation already made on the other side, and say,

"The land has bubbles, as the water has, and these are of them."

The petition was then laid upon the table, and the bubble burst. It had been inflated so long, that it had lost all its capacity for further expansion, and the whole exploded at once, and ended in nothing, unless it be thought that the dissemination of the opinions uttered on either side were worth the time consumed in the three days' discussion. Some, who regard the House of Commons chiefly as an arena or stage, on which different parties are to combat for victory in debate, may con-

ceive the time well employed ; but we, who think that the House of Commons is an assembly for the transaction of real business, and the bringing to the test of rejection or adoption, the measures proposed for the benefit of the country, think that every discussion should terminate in the submitting some proposition arising out of it : or otherwise every subject may be exhausted in preliminary debates which end in nothing ; and when the real contest comes to take place, in dividing upon the measure recommended, the previous exhaustion will so break down the interest, lessen the utility of any subsequent debate, that it will be difficult to bring men either to speak or act upon it with any thing like the earnestness and vigour that is essential to carry any great measure through the House. We hope therefore to see this comparatively new feature, of long discussions and adjourned debates without divisions, speedily reformed.

#### CULPABILITY OF THOSE WHO DECLINE TO ACT WHEN THE GREAT INTERESTS OF A NATION ARE AT STAKE.

SOLON, the celebrated legislator of Athens, we are told, enacted a law for the capital punishment of every citizen who should continue neuter when parties ran high in that republic. He considered, it should seem, the declining to take a decided part on great and critical occasions, an indication of such a culpable indifference to the interest of the commonwealth, as could be expiated only by death. While we blame the rigour of this law, we must confess the principle on which it was founded, is just and solid. In a political contest, relating to particular men or measures, a well-wisher may be permitted to remain silent ; but when the great interests of a nation are at stake, it becomes every man to act with firmness and vigour.—*Robert Hall.*

#### CHARITY AND SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

We need not discuss the various causes which have tended to render old endowments in favour of education so signally inefficient. The labours of the Commissioners for inquiring into abuses connected with Public Charities, are partially before the public :—we trust the time is not far distant, when some practical good will be attained by the investigation. It is disgraceful, that trustees should be permitted, for the sake of securing emoluments, to teach nothing but Latin and Greek to a few select pupils, where the donors of the funds have distinctly prescribed the education of the lower classes, of persons not having the means of common sustentation, nay, of parish paupers. The mild correctives of legislative wisdom must surely be applied before long to such monstrous evils. From the times to which we have just referred, down to the year 1798, the spirit of slumber seems to have settled upon the country with regard to popular education. Sunday Schools had, indeed, for some years been extensively established in various parts of the kingdom, and, in detached situations, were carried on with various degrees of success ; but, as they were then chiefly taught by hired teachers, most of them were miserably conducted. Still, a certain proportion of good was done. As early as the year 1787, the Sunday School Society were able to report, that “the schools were well attended ; that the scholars not only learned to read, but that their general behaviour was improved, and that the very neighbourhood in which such schools were established, exhibited examples of decency, regularity, and security, to which they had long been unaccustomed.” It was not till the beginning of the present century, that gratuitous teachers fairly took out of the hands of the hireling, this “work of faith and labour of love.”—*Eclectic Review.*

## FIRST DISCUSSION ON THE DISSENTERS' CLAIMS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

WE have not hitherto noticed in our pages the proceedings in the House of Lords; and our reason for this omission is, that we do not remember any thing of public interest or importance that has transpired in that assembly since the opening of the Session: besides which, our pages have been already fully occupied with the proceedings of the House of Commons; and to them we shall still give the largest share of our space and attention, because the Commoners being responsible to their constituents, who may return or remove them at a future election, it is more important that their proceedings should be extensively known than those of the Lords, who are irresponsible, and placed above all check or controul. Still, however, when any thing of very pressing interest or importance takes place in the Upper House, we shall occasionally notice its proceedings as well as those of the Lower.

On the evening of Friday, the 21st inst., it being known that Lord Grey would present a Petition from certain resident Members of the University of Cambridge, for the admission of Dissenters to that University, the subject attracted great attention, and the House of Lords was well filled with Peers at an early hour. The business of the Commons being uninviting, a large number of Commoners (not less than two hundred at least) attended below the bar, and in front of and around the throne, to hear the debate; while the two galleries—the one for gentlemen, and the other for ladies—were crowded: the whole presenting a very animated appearance. In addition to the greater size of the House of Lords, and its more rich and appropriate furniture, it must be admitted that there is an air of good breeding and refinement—of calm dignity and gentlemanly courtesy—which gives to their proceedings a very superior tone of elevation above those of the House of Commons. The members are not so numerous—the large majority are older—and there is not the same eager desire to speak, and consequent competition for the favour of catching the Speaker's eye, as in the Lower House; and in those few who do take part in the debates, there is a higher average of talent; so that a good discussion in the House of Lords is much more agreeable to hear and witness than one in the House of Commons.

The speakers on the motion for laying this petition on the table, were only five:—Earl Grey, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Ellenborough, Lord Brougham, and Lord Durham; the Duke of Cumberland saying only a few words. Of the speeches, Lord Grey's was the longest, the Duke of Wellington's the most impassioned, Lord Ellenborough's the smoothest, Lord Brougham's the most powerful, Lord

Durham's the most liberal, and the Duke of Cumberland's the most feeble. They were all, however, well worth listening to; and none of them were in the least degree tiresome, or awakened the slightest feeling of impatience, which is a rare thing to say of any debate whatever in the House of Commons. The claims of other topics on our space will render it impossible to give the whole of the speeches: but we feel the importance of the subject so strongly that we shall give all we can of each.

Earl GREY said he had now to present to their lordships a petition which appeared to him to deserve their most serious and attentive consideration. This petition came from a number of members of the University of Cambridge, who, although members of the established church, prayed that their lordships would relieve the Dissenters from one of those grievances which, in their petitions to Parliament, the Dissenters had described as one with which their interests were deeply connected, and which they anxiously wished to be removed. In the prayer of that petition he need not state to their lordships, to whom his opinions were well known, his entire concurrence. That petition had been put into his hands by most respectable individuals, and he was happy to bring it before the house, praying, as it did, for an object which appeared to him to be most just and reasonable in itself, and which, if agreed to, would, in his opinion, prove eminently conducive to the interests of the established church. It was signed by 63 members of the University of Cambridge—a number bearing a most respectable proportion to the whole number of members of the senate generally resident in that University. The number generally resident, he was told, was somewhere between 170 and 180. The number of persons by whom it was signed amounted therefore to more than one-third of the actual residents. He believed that, from the resident members of the senate, there must be deducted several who, from age, infirmity, and other causes, seldom took part in the affairs of the senate; and he had also to state that several members of the senate, who had not signed the petition, to the number of eight or ten at least, were favourable to its prayer. He had therefore to state, and he would state it with confidence, that a very considerable proportion of those members of the senate who took part generally in the affairs of that body were favourable to the prayer of this petition. But he felt still greater satisfaction in stating that it was signed by men who were highly respectable for their moral worth and their extensive attainments. It was signed by 2 heads of houses, by 9 professors, and by 11 tutors of colleges, comprising some of the most eminent members of the University. He need not state to any one who was at all acquainted with the University of Cambridge, the high character of those by whom the petition was signed, when he mentioned the names of Professors Airy, Sedgwick, Musgrave, Lee, and many others, than whom there were not more eminent persons in the University—eminent for general knowledge, eminent for Science, eminent for the excellence of their moral conduct in life, and well known to be zealously attached to the interests of the established church. Amongst the tutors they found the names of men equally celebrated. It was only necessary, in proof of this allegation, to mention the names of Messrs. Peacock, Bowstead, and Thirlwall. The last-named gentleman was considered one of the most eminent scholars in Europe, and no body of men could be more estimable for their moral character, for their extensive acquirements, or for the enlightened and honest zeal which distinguished their attachment to the established church. Amongst others whom he might particularly notice was the Rev. Mr. Hughes,—a gentleman who was highly distinguished in the University, and who, he believed, was now examining chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln. It could not for a moment be supposed that such individuals as these could harbour any design against the interests of the established church. He might, perhaps, be asked how it happened that an application of this kind had been made to their lordships, when it might have been made to the senate of the University? The reason was short and satisfactory. It was merely this—that under the existing system the petitioners had it not in their power to proceed in that manner with any chance of success. This was sufficiently explained by a reference to the

constitution of the senate. It was, according to that constitution, in the power of the caput, and not only of the caput, but in the power of every individual of that body, to put a veto on any proposition that might be made. On two occasions attempts were made to bring the case of the Dissenters before that body. Professor Farish endeavoured to bring it under consideration in Michaelmas term last. His proposition was at once met by a positive negative. It was afterwards introduced by Professor Hewett, in Hilary term last, and it was again met by a positive denial. The petitioners found that they could proceed in no other way, and therefore they had come to this house. They had no chance of succeeding where such a power existed; for if nine-tenths of the University of Cambridge were in favour of any particular measure, though it might appear to be for the interest of the university or of the church, yet any one member of the caput might, by exercising this prejudicial veto, put an end to it. Such was the reason which induced the petitioners to come to that house?

Many might suppose that what this petition prayed for was not consistent with the original institution of the University of Cambridge. But such was not the fact; the petitioners sought to remove restrictions which were imposed on the University long subsequent to its foundation, and under the circumstances which was stated in the petition. He did not think that any danger was likely to result to the established church by adopting such a course. On the contrary, he was of opinion that it would be productive of great and manifold benefits. He could not imagine that the admission to university honours of individuals of high character and great learning, though differing from the established church in their religious tenets, could be productive of any ill effect. Those individuals having the benefit of a learned education, having reaped the fruits of that instruction which the university afforded, when they arrived at that period when they naturally wished to apply for those distinctions to which they were entitled, ought not to be stopped short in their honourable career. He could not conceive that any danger either to the church or to the university could or would result from acceding to their application. In his view of the question it would be more really conducive to the true interests of the church and to the true interests of the university if that course was adopted which would bring members of the Church of England and Dissenters more closely together,—which would tend to soften angry feelings, to obliterate the marked line of distinction which now existed between the two bodies, and to do away with that animosity which a sense of injury and of exclusion necessarily engendered. This, in his opinion, would be truly beneficial. This was not his own opinion merely. In stating it, he expressed the opinion of many wise and good men. The illustrious duke opposite (the Duke of Cumberland) had asked him on a former occasion whether this petition came from members of both universities; and he informed the illustrious duke in reply, that it emanated only from the University of Cambridge. The reason of this was, because they would see a most material distinction between the rules and regulations of the two universities. At Cambridge a Dissenter of any denomination might be admitted to the advantage of a learned education without subscribing any declaration whatever, and many were now seeking education there who were not members of the established church. This was not the practice at the other university, where, on matriculation, they took the oath. Now, he would ask, had any evil or any disadvantage whatever been experienced by the Church of England from the practice which prevailed in the University of Cambridge? Far from it. He believed that instances could be adduced where Dissenters who were educated at Cambridge had become members of the Established Church. If Dissenters were admitted to all the previous advantages of education in the university,—if they studied there for three years, the time necessary to elapse before a degree could be conferred,—when they had been suffered to go so far, was it, he demanded, expedient, was it just, could it be useful to the church, to stop short at the period when they had by study and by long residence a right to expect, in reason, that they should receive the well-earned fruits of their care and industry? Was that the time to shut the door against them, and to refuse them the liberty of profiting by those advantages which their education at the university had enabled them to possess? Why should not a Dissenter educated at the

university be allowed to assume those academic honours which gave importance to professional men? Many of the Dissenters at Cambridge had evinced abilities of the highest order. He had heard of a Quaker there who had distinguished himself greatly at his examinations. Was it, he again asked, fitting, after a residence of three years,—after having received all the benefit of an enlightened education—that the Dissenter should be told that he must stop short—that he should be deprived of that which was the object of his most anxious desire? If those individuals were, by these means, deprived of those advantages which they ought to derive from a great civil establishment, would they not struggle hard in order that they might be allowed to attain them by the formation of other establishments? That was a consideration which he thought it was very natural for them to attend to; for assuredly it was not just, if they were not admitted to the full benefit of the two universities, to prevent them from obtaining elsewhere the same advantages which they vainly looked for in those universities, conformably with their own views and feelings. Believing as he did in the superior purity and excellence of the doctrines and tenets of the established church, he certainly did think that the most likely effect of conceding what was asked for in the petition to which he was now calling their lordships' notice, would be to bring over to the established church many persons who did not at present belong to it. He thought, therefore, that he had stated sufficient reasons for inducing their lordships to inquire carefully into the expediency of complying with the prayer of the petition,—a prayer founded, as he conceived, in justice, and supported on grounds entirely consistent with the most earnest desire, which in all these discussions ought to be professed and entertained, for the security and welfare of the established church. (Hear, hear.) It was, in his opinion, unnecessary for him to state any thing further on these points before he proceeded to read the remainder of the petition, to which he was desirous of calling their lordships' most serious attention. He believed that he had satisfactorily shown that the petition asked for nothing inconsistent with the original constitution of the University. It proposed that Dissenters should be admitted to the privilege of obtaining degrees—a concession which could be in no wise dangerous either to the University or the establishment, and would at the same time relieve from disabilities, of which they justly complained, a class of persons who, on account of their general attachment to the liberties and constitution of the country, were as much deserving of the attention of that house as any class of His Majesty's subjects. (Hear, hear.) He professed himself to be a sincere and ardent well-wisher to the success of their claims whenever they were supported by justice, but whenever they were pushed to an unreasonable length, and pressed forward in combination with declarations which, if acted on, would, he thought, be destructive of the established church, he should not fail to oppose them. He lamented that a want of moderation should have been shown by any portion of the Dissenters, for he thought that it could be productive of no other result than deep injury to their cause; but he conscientiously believed that the great majority of those who dissented from the church disapproved very much of the proceedings to which he alluded. (Hear, hear.) They were, indeed, entirely disclaimed by several members of that respectable body with whom he had had that day an interview, and who stated, that though not as Dissenters, but as members of the community, they might entertain the opinion, which had been maintained by some men attached to the doctrines of the church of England, that the existence of any established church whatever did not tend to the advantage of religion; yet they were not willing to press that question on the Legislature, being desirous of confining their complaints to those grievances of which they could fairly complain, and from which he would most anxiously and earnestly endeavour to relieve them, whenever he had an opportunity of successfully bringing forward a measure for that purpose.

The Duke of WELLINGTON rose, and said that he should have followed on the present occasion the course which he had pursued on other occasions—namely, to refrain from discussing the subject matter of petitions at the time of their presentation, had not a great degree of importance been attached to the one now under consideration, in consequence of the previous notice given by the noble earl



of his intention to present it, and the speech with which the noble earl had introduced it to their lordships. Under these circumstances, he felt it necessary to address a few words to the house at the present moment. He certainly could not help lamenting that the illustrious duke, the Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, was not in his place in their lordships' house on the present occasion, for he would have been able to state, with much more accuracy than he (the Duke of Wellington) could, what were the peculiar circumstances attending the granting of degrees in the particular University to which the petition referred. (Hear, hear.) He (the Duke of Wellington) could not be supposed to be much acquainted with matters of this description, relating to either university, but less so with reference to Cambridge University than Oxford University; but it appeared from the statement of the noble earl himself, that the University of Cambridge was a corporation possessing the power of judging and deciding on the very question which formed the prayer of the petition. (Hear, hear.) The present petition, then, was a petition from sixty members of this corporation (most respectable individuals he admitted them to be); and here again he had occasion to regret that the illustrious duke (the Chancellor of the University) was not present, to bear testimony to their high character, calling upon their lordships to interfere in their legislative capacity, in order to overrule the decision come to by the other members of the corporation. The noble earl had stated, no doubt with great accuracy, the history of the regulations respecting the grant of degrees, and had called on the house to review those regulations and alter them, at the request of the sixty individuals whose names were attached to the present petition. But he believed that the entire senate was composed of some 4000 individuals, and he was confident that, had the proposition referred to in the petition been brought regularly before the senate, the sixty individuals whose names were attached to the petition would have been found to be the only individuals in its favour, while all the remaining members were opposed to it.

But when any question respecting Dissenters was submitted to their lordships, their first business ought to be to inquire, "Who were Dissenters?" Many of them only differed from members of the Church of England respecting one or two articles; others, again, did not agree with the members of the establishment on any one point. Some denied the existence of the Trinity, and some were complete Atheists. It therefore became a serious question for their lordships's consideration whether they would adopt any measure which would have the effect of giving power in the Universities to persons comprehended under the vague denomination of Dissenters. (Hear, hear.) That the regulations of the University at Cambridge differed from those of the University at Oxford was perfectly true. The noble earl had stated that a Dissenter might receive his education at Cambridge, but that he could not take the degree of bachelor of arts, unless he was prepared to sign certain articles, which were nothing else than the articles of Christianity, and which he was required to sign as the articles of his education as a Christian. If he refused to sign, he could not of course obtain a degree, and this was described to be a grievance, because it subjected him to disadvantages in the professions of law and medicine. He believed that in the medical profession a university degree did carry with it some advantages, and in the profession of the law it enabled the professor to save two years in keeping his terms. But this was not owing to the regulations of the Universities—it was owing to the rules adopted by the benchers of the Inns of Court and other bodies, over which the authorities of the University had no controul. Under these circumstances, he entreated their lordships not to consent unnecessarily to interfere with the charters of the University of Cambridge, and force it, on the application of a small minority of the members of the senate, to make alterations in its own by-laws. (Hear, hear.)

Lord ELLENBOROUGH was of opinion that no question could be brought before their lordships more important, or more interesting to large classes of His Majesty's subjects, than that which had been introduced to the notice of the house by the presentation of the present petition. In considering this subject he apprehended there would be felt not merely difficulties in principle, but practical difficulties, which even if the difficulties in principle should be surmounted, the

Legislature would not be able successfully to encounter. Undoubtedly the objections mentioned by his noble friend who had just sat down to interfering by Parliamentary enactment with the charters and privileges of the University of Cambridge were not small. He (Lord Ellenborough) confessed that he felt the greatest disposition to acquiesce, if practicable, in the wishes of the petitioners. He saw great advantage to the public in providing for the joint education of all classes of his Majesty's subjects, though entertaining different religious opinions, in an establishment where the ministers of the established church received their instruction. (Hear, hear.) He considered that such unions formed in early life for the purpose of education would be productive of great advantage to the established church, and of very great advantage to the country. (Hear, hear.) On the other hand, it could not be considered in any other light than as a great disadvantage to cause any persons professing a particular religious belief to entertain the feeling that they were harshly treated by the laws of the country, and excluded from benefits solely on account of their religious opinions. (Hear.) Undoubtedly there could not be any objection, on principle, to extending to persons dissenting from the church of England all such advantages resulting from the conferring of degrees in the Universities as might place them on an equal footing with their fellow subjects who were members of the church of England in the profession of medicine and the law. But he must at the same time declare that nothing should induce him to consent to grant to persons dissenting from the doctrines of the church of England power and authority in the Universities, which, though they might be lay corporations, he could not but consider as being practically, intimately, and essentially connected with the established church. (Hear, hear.) Here he drew a distinction from which nothing should induce him to depart. Any advantage which the Dissenters required to enjoy at the Universities, and which it would be consistent with principle and practically possible for their lordships to grant, let them have it in common with their fellow-subjects of the established church; but he would grant them nothing which, by possibility, could lead to their obtaining any power or authority from which injury might result to the church of England. He stated distinctly the principle by which he should be guided, if he should be called on to give any vote on this deeply interesting and important subject. At present he was ready to do any thing in his power, whatever his private and personal feelings might be on the question, for the purpose of maintaining, if it were now possible, religious peace in this country. The preservation of religious peace was the object of the noble duke who had just sat down, in proposing the two great measures of religious relief which passed during his tenure of office. In the attainment of that object he (Lord Ellenborough) would be ever ready to assist; and he confessed that at the present moment he saw nothing more likely to prevent its consummation than the adoption of a course by that house, or by the Legislature, which should have the effect of associating with that difference in religious opinions which they might not be able to overcome political distinctions, of uniting both, and, by uniting them, of inflicting on this country the greatest curse with which any community could be visited. (Hear, hear.)

The LORD CHANCELLOR said he had heard with the greatest satisfaction many of the sentiments to which the noble baron had just given utterance. The expressions which had fallen from the noble baron of toleration and of friendly regard towards those who conscientiously dissented from the Established Church, and the wise counsel which he had given to the members of the establishment, to follow the path of peace and conciliation, as being the most likely to lead to the security of their own church, had caused him (the Lord Chancellor) great satisfaction; and he could not help thinking that they came with peculiar and appropriate grace from the descendants of one of the most eloquent, learned, and, without desiring to institute any disparaging or invidious comparison, one of the most tolerant and enlightened prelates that ever lived, either during his own time or at the present moment. (Hear, hear.) He repeated, that it was highly grateful to him to find such sentiments entertained by the noble lord, with whom he also agreed in thinking that it was hardly possible to overrate the importance of the subject under consideration, as it would be difficult to overrate the diffi-

culties attending it. In his mind there did not exist any difficulty in point of principle, but merely as to the details of the measure, and the manner in which it might be thought expedient to carry it into effect. Whether, for instance, any guards or restrictions should, on mature consideration, be deemed necessary (but if not necessary, most inexpedient, in his opinion, would such restrictions be) in carrying into effect the great principle of civil and religious liberty, which this question jointly involved. That there might be difficulties besetting their path, in seeking the best mode of acting on these principles, he was as ready as the noble baron to admit. But he must say that he considered this to be no speculative question; it was no visionary or fancied grievance of which the Dissenters now complained; it was not a matter merely of principle, as many of the subjects lately taken up by that highly respectable and most virtuous and enlightened body of men appeared to him in some respects to be; but it was a practical evil—a grievance which met them in the ordinary transactions of life, and which imposed a burden on them in the way of disqualification, from which the rest of their fellow subjects were free (hear, hear)—free, he repeated, only because they conscientiously adhered to the doctrines of the established religion of the state, and conformed to its rules and discipline, and from which the Dissenters were not free, only because they as conscientiously dissented from the Established Church, and would not conform to its discipline. (Hear, hear.) By the same rule as he claimed for himself, and for the bulk of their lordships, the undeniable and imprescriptible right to have a church which they approved of, and to follow the principles which they professed—by the same rule, and by the parity of the same reason, was he compelled (but that he did it cheerfully, and therefore should not say that he was compelled) at once to grant to all Dissenters the right as high and imprescriptible on their part to worship their Creator according to the dictates of their own conscience, without being degraded in their own eyes or those of their fellow-subjects for so doing. (Hear.) He would not, however, weary their lordships by insisting on truisms, for he believed no person would be found hardy enough to remain adverse in principle to the propositions which he had just stated. But though universally admitted in principle, they were yet denied in practice, and there was no denial of them which created a greater practical grievance to the Dissenters than their actual exclusion from all academic distinctions. Their lordships would not, he believed, admit (at least he would not) that it could be possible for this exclusion to last much longer, whether by the law or practice of the country, or by the University statutes, royal ordinances, or academical rules. That it should continue much longer in these our days he held to be a thing utterly impossible. (Hear.) If any man were asked to point to the country and the age in which it was inconceivable that such an exclusion existed, he would, if he were ignorant of the fact, at once point to England as the country, and to the 19th century as the era. (Hear, hear.) If a man wished to follow the medical profession, being desirous to devote his faculties and time to that most useful employment, painful to many individuals, but useful beyond almost all other professions to the community at large, he might, if he belonged to the established church, be enabled to pursue the profession by going to the University at Oxford or Cambridge, by residing within his own country, and by obtaining his education there; not, however, his medical education, be it observed, because though the two universities are the only two bodies having the power of granting medical degrees, they are also the only bodies which at once have the monopoly of the privilege, and of the incapacity to teach. (Great laughter.) They at once claimed for themselves the exclusive power of making doctors, and at the same time loudly admitted, for they proclaimed their incapacity, that they could not teach medicine. (“Hear,” and laughter.) They could only make doctors; they could not qualify them. (Continued laughing.) They could make a man a master of arts by teaching him mathematics and the classics; but he must learn medicine elsewhere; and after qualifying himself by seven years’ study in another part of the world, return to the bosom of his *alma mater* for the purpose of being created a doctor. (Laughter.) But if the same individual happened to be a conscientious Dissenter, he could not go to Oxford at all. He would, to be sure, be admitted at Cambridge, but even there he could

not be able to obtain a mathematical or doctor's degree. For the purpose of obtaining a degree in medicine, he must quit his home, his family, and friends, to go to a foreign country. He must repair to Paris, to the Dutch Universities, as formerly used to be the case, or to the Scotch universities, for in London a knowledge of the medical art was not to be acquired. It should be borne in mind that the law of Scotland was different in many respects from the law of England, and he (the Lord Chancellor) knew of many parents who had been deterred by that very circumstance alone from sending their children to that country for the purpose of medical education. Still, however, the Dissenter had no chance; he might go abroad and remain there for three or four years, at great expense, receiving instructions in medical science, and he might return again and find himself just in the same situation, as far as concerned the means of obtaining a degree, as when he first left. Why was he subject to this hardship? Simply because he conscientiously differed from the religious opinions of the majority of his fellow-subjects in this part of the country. (Hear, hear.) That was the reason, and the only reason of the grievance under which the Dissenters now laboured, and under which he justly, and not one note louder than he ought, now complained.

The Earl of DUNHAM adverted to the regret expressed by the noble duke as to the absence of the illustrious field-marshal, the Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, from whom he might have had assistance in the present conversation, but it was to be recollected that there was still present another illustrious field-marshal, the Chancellor of the University of Dublin, to whom he might well look for that concurrence and support, of which in other instances accident deprived him. The noble duke certainly regretted the absence of that illustrious personage, but that was not the only misfortune which befel him in the course of his advocacy of that which he was pleased to describe as the real sentiments of the University. The laws of the University, as the house was well aware, excluded Dissenters from the advantages of degrees with a view to the practice of the lay professions. Now, with the permission of the noble duke, he would ask him this—When he was the commander-in-chief of that gallant and conquering army which sustained the glory of the British name through so many campaigns, and brought a very doubtful contest to a conclusion full of triumph,—he would ask that noble duke whether he thought it would excite in his breast any feeling of sympathy with the great body of his dissenting fellow-countrymen if he had been compelled to inquire in his selection and employment of officers if they had subscribed the thirty-nine articles of the church? He hoped that their lordships would not attach any importance to the argument founded upon the assertion that the effect of the changes which the petitioners sought would be to overwhelm all corporations. The present petition had been considered as an attack upon all corporations, but he was sure noble lords would feel that that was any thing but a faithful representation of the matter, for the petitioners did not complain of any act done by the corporation. But if they had, it would not have been a complaint uttered for the first time, as the history of that, as well as the history of other Universities, fully testified. He would just beg their lordships' attention to a short extract from Dyer's *Academic Unity*, in which that writer stated that "The preface to the statutes made in his (Edward VI.'s) reign rightly begins with declaring 'that the ancient statutes are obscure, unintelligible, seem barbarous, and that others more intelligible, fashioned more according to the condition of the times, and to the practice of the new learning, became requisite.'" His noble friend had referred to the well-known letter of James I., but it should be recollected in all references to that communication, that the first of the Stuarts was a monarch in nowise celebrated for his attachment to liberty. He was thus adverting briefly to the various topics which had been touched on in the course of the discussion, for it did appear to him a matter of the highest importance that every light should be thrown upon a question of such moment; and for the purpose of letting in that light as effectively as possible, he did not scruple to appeal to the illustrious duke opposite, to state, as he might be able to do from his long residence in Germany, the practice of Protestant universities on the continent. Some noble lords appeared to be apprehensive that concession to the fair claims of the Dissenters might be fraught with danger to the Established Church. Of that danger he for

one entertained not the slightest apprehension,—why should there be any danger? Did any noble lord mean to say that such was the condition of the Established Church, that it could not exist without exclusive privileges? So far from his being a party to any such declaration, he should frankly and at once declare, that he, as a member of that church, desired nothing more for it than a clear stage and no favour. It was his full and deliberate conviction that the possession of exclusive privileges superinduced amongst the members, and still more amongst the clergy of the Established Church, an indifference most fatal to its interest. Instead of that lively, vigilant, and active exertion, essential to the maintenance and advancement of its beneficial working, those to whose care its interests were intrusted overlooked the labours of those who for a long time past had been sowing seeds, the growth from which, at no distant period, would acquire a strength with which the power of that house would in vain endeavour to cope. He desired to know what benefit was expected to result from the refusal! Sure he was, that the Dissenters would be impatient to an intense degree, under the effect of such refusal; and if it did not carry with it an accession of strength to the church, he hesitated not to affirm that it would bring an accession of weakness—weakness from within and hatred from without. Instead of having the Dissenters remaining, as respected the church, in a condition of neutrality, the effect of that refusal would be to convert that neutrality into the condition of mortal conflict, if the refusal, which he hoped never would be uttered, were uttered and persisted in. Would it not be an act of hostility against the Dissenters to refuse their claims and deny to them those concessions which in an enlightened age the great body of the people held to be their legitimate right? Could any man doubt that it would give great weight to the Dissenters, in any contest such as he had been glancing at, to have it known and admitted in society at large that the claims of dissent were founded in truth and justice, and that the resistance to their claims was considered in all quarters but one to be unwise and impolitic, and self-destructive to that which might in such circumstances seek to exist as a monopolized and exclusive church? (“No, no,” from the Opposition benches.) Noble lords might express their dissent, but he would contend that the results of their resistance to which he was adventing could not be otherwise than in perfect accordance with his anticipation. Would it then be wise—would it be safe—that such an impression should go abroad as that that house at all approved of the resistance offered by certain parties to any such changes as those which the petitioners prayed might be conceded? Let noble lords only remember what a large and powerful body the Dissenters were, how numerous and now influential, and above all, so active. Would it be sound policy to alienate the affections of men who constituted one half or one third of the whole community? But they were recommended to wait until a proposition for improvement proceeded from other quarters—till the heads of the church of their own free will, and as the spontaneous result of their liberality, proposed that of which the Dissenters had now so reasonably and so justly required the concession. He feared that they would wait long if they waited for the operation of reason alone—an apprehension in which he found himself strengthened by the opinion of Archdeacon Paley in his defence of Bishop Law. It bore with so much force on the present question, that he could not refrain from reading it to their lordships:—“As the man who attacks a flourishing establishment writes with a halter round his neck, few ever will be found to attempt alterations but men of more spirit than prudence, of more sincerity than caution, of warm, eager, and impetuous tempers; that consequently, if we are to wait for improvement till the cool, the calm, the discreet part of mankind begin it, till the church governors solicit, or Ministers of State propose it, I will venture to pronounce that (without *His* interposition with whom nothing is impossible) we may remain as we are till the renovation of all things.”

The Duke of CUMBERLAND concurred with the noble duke near him in every thing that he had said that night, and though he was himself the Chancellor of the University of Dublin, it did not follow that he should maintain the applicability of the laws of that learned body to the government of the English Universities. He lamented as much as the noble earl opposite the absence of his illustrious relative—an absence he was sure occasioned by nothing less than sickness.

The Archbishop of York, and four of the Bishops sat on the Episcopal bench, in their robes, but neither of them ventured a word on the subject. They were as silent in the defence of the Universities, as Lord Althorp was the other evening on the ejection of the right rev. Fathers from their present seats; and the discretion of both parties deserves to be commended: for in each case, there was so little to be said, that it was well to withhold that little, for the sake of not exposing its poverty.

For ourselves, we consider the first blow to the separation of Church and State to be already struck; and a few more such efforts will accomplish the good work. The abolition of Church Rates, and the admission of the Dissenters to an equality of privileges with Churchmen, will add largely to the number of Dissenters. Every addition to their numbers will not only increase their present strength, but will hasten the period when they will form the numerical majority of the country; and whenever they know and feel that they have arrived at this point, it will be as impossible as it would be unjust to prevent their demanding what they all admit to be their *ultimate* wish, though considerations of prudence alone prevents their pressing it just at this particular moment, namely, the total disconnection of the State with any one form of Christianity rather than another, and the putting of Catholics and Protestants, Churchmen and Quakers, Jews and Gentiles, all upon one and the same footing, as far as religious liberty and equality can make them so. Anything short of this is contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, as well as to the dictates of justice; for if any one may claim pre-eminence to-day, as the religion of the greatest number, another may make the same claim and on the same ground a year hence; and thus Religious Supremacy be made to rise and fall like the price of funds on the Stock Exchange, and the peace and safety of the community be endangered by an annual revolution of the sects aiming at the dominancy of power. Let us have the courage then to look the evil fairly in the face, and meet it by the only true mode, of granting full, free, and equal religious liberty to all, which never can be accomplished but by the separation of Church and State, which *all* the Dissenters *think*, but which they will not all yet *declare*; which we also think, and for which reason, we will *now* declare, believing, as we do, That truth need never be concealed from fear of her discomfiture: but that she is so omnipotent, that though all the world were arrayed against her she will ultimately prevail: and being ourselves one of that class described by Dr. Paley, in the quotation read by Lord Durham, at the close of his speech on the Cambridge Petition, we speak out boldly now, in the conviction that before a year is over, tens of thousands will re-echo our sentiments.

#### CONNECTION OF IGNORANCE WITH CRIME.

In September last (1831), out of fifty prisoners put on trial at Bedford, only four could read. In the month of January (1833), there were in the same prison between fifty and sixty awaiting their trials, of whom not more than ten could read, and even some of these could not make out the sense of a sentence, though they knew their letters. At Wisbeach, in the Isle of Ely, it appears from a memorandum on the calendar, of a kind which ought to be affixed to every similar document, that, out of nineteen prisoners put on trial, only six were able to read and write; and it is added, the capital offences were committed entirely by persons in a state of the most debasing ignorance.—*Official Report*

## MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ON Wednesday, the 19th instant, the House was almost entirely occupied with discussions on the disfranchisement of the corrupt boroughs of Carrickfergus, Stafford, and Hertford ; and the disfranchisement of the corrupt freemen of Liverpool. In each of these cases, the Tories made every effort to screen the guilty : and in the Liverpool case, Mr. Hughes Hughes, the member for Oxford, publicly expressed his consolation in the belief, that though the Bill should pass the Lower House it would happily be rejected by the Upper ; while Lord John Russell, to the surprize and regret of many, urged some strong objections to certain defects, by which he considered the Bill to be characterized ; and after speaking on its defects, abandoned its merits, by leaving the House, and not voting at all, which many thought to be a too fatal omen of its ultimate defeat by the Lords. Time will reveal.

Mr. Tooke, on this evening, obtained leave, in conjunction with Dr. Lushington and Mr. G. F. Young, to bring in a Bill, for prohibiting the use of climbing boys in the sweeping of chimneys, under the age of 14 years ; a measure, in the success of which, all the friends of humanity must, we think, feel a deep interest : as the condition of the slaves in the West Indies, bad as it has been, is certainly preferable to that of these little victims, whose sufferings no language could exaggerate, and at whose rescue from their present miserable condition, every feeling heart must rejoice.

On Thursday, the 20th, the morning sitting was occupied with the discussion on the Liverpool Petition, reported in another part of the Review : and in the evening sitting, a few notices of motions were given, and petitions presented, when the House broke up early, adjourning at seven o'clock.

On Friday, the 21st, the discussion on the Liverpool Petition was continued through the morning ; and in the evening, the Ordnance Estimates underwent examination. They were brought forward by Col. Maberly, who is the head of the Ordnance Department, in the House of Commons ; and all the sums required were voted, though not without much comment and opposition from Mr. Hume.

On Saturday the 22d, the House met at four, to advance some measures then before it a stage ; but without any discussion taking place, as it adjourned again before five o'clock till Monday.

On Monday, the 24th, the morning sitting was occupied by a long discussion on the Petition from the members of the University of Cambridge, praying that Dissenters might be admitted to graduate in that University as well as Churchmen. The Petition was presented by Mr. Spring Rice, one of the members for the town of Cambridge (the two members for the University being Sir Charles Manners Sutton, the Speaker, and Mr. Goulburn), in an excellent and appropriate speech ; but as we have printed the debate in the Lords, on the same subject,

at great length, we must confine ourselves to a single extract here. He said :

Why was it that the able upholders of the religious institutions of the country were the earnest supporters of the claims of the Dissenters ? It was because they were deeply attached to the established church ; and on that account they were entitled to attention when they told the house that, for the sake of the church and the University, those harassing distinctions which excluded the Dissenters should be removed, the concession of the claims of one being identified with the true interests of the other. (Hear.) He would now look to the origin of these exclusions. Let not hon. members think they were the work of those great men to whom the church looked up with reverence, or that they were coeval with the Reformation (hear)—that they were the work of the reign of Elizabeth or Edward VI., or of the Ridleys, the Cranmers, and the Latimers, the leaders and martyrs of the Christian faith. No—the exclusion was reserved for other days ; it was reserved for a monarch, who in state affairs laid down the doctrine of kingcraft, who derived his religious opinions from the conferences at Hampton Court, who added to the literature of his country a treatise on demonology, and who declared that the established church was “a bad mass said in English, and required but the lifting up of the hands to make it rank Popery.” (Hear, hear.) It was not from such a source as that our church could anticipate any mighty blessings ; but how had the exclusion worked ? Up to the reign of James I. no religious test was required from the Dissenter to qualify him for the honour of a degree. The ancient statutes of the University, which were consolidated in the reign of Elizabeth, in 1570, although dealing largely in university oaths,—although prohibiting the midwives of the country by an oath or test from the use of rose-water in the performance of certain ceremonies, yet no religious test whatever was imposed on admission to the honours of the University. Among the documents upon this subject, the non-existence of any test was distinctly proved by the royal letter in 1613 to the University of Cambridge, in these words :—“ Understanding by your private answer made unto our challenge, that there was no established decree or ordinance for the denial of degrees to such as refuse to subscribe, &c.” Here it was distinctly admitted that no religious test was required, and what did the King proceed to do ? Not to introduce the present system ; no he did not go so far, but stated, in so many words,—“ In signification of our dislike of the degree of a doctor of physic granted without subscription to Mr. Burgesse, who on a humour of schism or faction, apostatizing from his orders, hath taken himself to physic ;” and then proceeded to direct that a grace should be passed requiring subscription from bachelors of divinity, or doctors of law, physic, or divinity, and that no person should be admitted who had not subscribed the three articles of the thirty sixth canon. So that if you found a schismatic apothecary who had been working his way to the church, it would not have been any ground of objection, but his quitting the church, and going to practise as a doctor, where he could not do the establishment any injury by his apostacy, was an objection, the force of which he confessed he did not see.

It was important to see how His Majesty followed this up, in order to judge of the legality of the subsequent proceedings. He directs the University to pass a law to carry the direction of his letter into effect ; accordingly a grace was passed imposing these religious tests upon doctors of the faculty and bachelors of divinity. Thus matters rested till the year 1616, when His Majesty having repaired to Newmarket for the purpose of amusement, thought it a fit period to revise the institutions of the country. At that time His Majesty's letters passed, which required that all who took degrees in schools should subscribe to the articles of the 36th canon. He omitted to accompany this with a direction for a grace, and consequently no grace was passed till the year 1772. Was it not, therefore, clear from the acts of the King himself (having shown that without such grace his letter would not be inoperative), that when he came to issue the second letter without the grace, it could have no effect ? (Hear, hear.) However, it had been acted on ; our own journal showed that at the outset of the troubles of the House of Stuart they were accustomed to deal very summarily with that house, and that house was rather disposed to submit to the interposition. There was a case of



this sort to be found in the reign of James I. His Majesty sent a message to the House of Commons, desiring them to have a conference with the other house. That was refused. He then sent a message desiring them to communicate with the judges, or in other words to call in the aid of the judges to assist them in their legislative capacity. Here, then, was a direct interference of the Crown with the Legislature, tantamount to the interference of the Crown with the Universities. The house submitted, and an entry on the journals, which he believed was made by Rushworth, stated that they were astonished and confounded, and that "At the last one stood up and said—'The Prince's command is like a thunderbolt; his command upon our allegiance is like the roaring of a lion. To his command there will be no contradiction; but how and in what manner we should now proceed to perform obedience, that will be the question.'" ("Hear," and laughter.) If, therefore, that command came upon the house like "a thunderbolt, and the roaring of a lion, it could not be a matter of surprise that the doctors of the university should give a reluctant consent to it. In the year 1641 there was a precedent which he knew would not receive much value in the eyes of some of his hon. friends, but in which the whole proceedings respecting the test were stated in a resolution of Parliament as being contrary to law, and therefore ought not to be suffered to exist; from that period and until 1660 the test ceased, and then it was reinforced. (Hear.) He mentioned this fact historically, not attaching any importance to the precedent; his argument was that the test was improperly imposed by the letter of James I., without any lawful authority, and that being improperly imposed, it ought not now to exist. So that even if it had been imposed by high authority, the reason of the case was so strongly against it, that whether by the interposition of that house or the university itself, the time was now arrived when that test should no longer exist. (Loud cries of "Hear.") In 1772 that was made university law, with some variation, which had previously only been an usurpation by the Crown, and tacitly acquiesced in by the university. About that time it was resolved, in order to relieve certain parties to some extent, that, in place of requiring a concurrence in the three articles of the 36th canon, a mere declaration was required that the parties should *bonâ fide* belong to the Establish Church. That resolution was adopted by a grace or law, and was now in existence.

It might be said that they were arguing upon abstract principles, but he would prove that at the period when these tests were proposed they had worked most injuriously in the university, and that their ill-working had been felt as soon as the grace had passed. He would read to the house a most important extract in elucidation of his statement:—"In the month of January, 1773, Mr. Thomas Blackburne, student of St. Peter's College, having passed the usual examination in his own society, and in the senate-house, applied for the degree of bachelor in arts, and was rejected. His testimonials and qualifications were as follow:—At the close of the examination, in his own college, the master signed a paper, importing that Mr. Blackburne, with two other persons, had resided for the major part of such a number of terms as the statute requires. A grace for his degree was then passed in college, which implies an approbation of his moral conduct, and proficiency in learning. He appears in the senate-house, at the customary hours of examination; and, as he was a youth who had greatly distinguished himself in all the previous exercises, is particularly noticed during the time of trial. He passes through that trial with applause; and, in the judgment of the moderators and all the examiners, is declared worthy of one of the first honours which the university is wont to bestow upon approved merit. At the close of this examination, when nothing now remained but what is too frequently regarded as a mere form and ceremony, the conscientious young man hints to the master and tutor of his college his objections to the declaration in question, and delivers into their hands the following declaration:—'I, Thomas Blackburne, do hereby declare my full persuasion of the truth of the Christian religion, as exhibited in the Scriptures; that I have hitherto communicated with the Established Church, and have no present intention of communicating with any other.' His 'supplicat,' or petition for his degree, is next presented to the caput; the subscription-book is called for; and, his name not appearing in its place, the vice-chancellor refuses

to read his supplicat, and he is consequently repelled from his degree." This gentleman having distinguished himself in the senate-house, possessing all the necessary qualifications with regard to the period spent in the college, and testimonials as to his moral character and scientific attainments,—not because he was a Dissenter, for he was in communion with the Established Church, but because he hesitated upon principle as a Protestant to put his hand to a paper, and subscribe a declaration without having fully considered the importance of the subject,—was deprived of those honours which a man of less talent, less moral worth, and fewer attainments, but of perhaps a more convenient conscience, might have enjoyed. (Cheers.) He was rejected. (Hear.) Was not that example worth any argument that could be brought forward on the other side? How many more instances must there not have occurred of the same description? But a few years afterwards a petition was presented from the under-graduates to the senate, expressing their attachment to the doctrines of the church, but complaining that, from the nature of their studies, they had not time to consider the declaration they were called on to subscribe, and that the obligation to do so was but laying a snare for their consciences. That was in the year 1772, and if the argument was of importance then, how did the case stand now? (Hear.) Were they to be told, that after having repealed the Test and Corporation Acts, after having conferred the principles of entire freedom on other classes, that it was necessary to argue against the maintenance of such institutions as these? (Hear.) Such an argument was a waste of time—it was fighting with a shadow; for there was not an argument that could suggest itself the fallacy of which was not apparent.

Mr. Goulburn made a long speech against the admission of the Dissenters, which he said would lead equally to the Jew and the Unitarian, and altogether unchristianize the whole course of studies in the University.

In the evening sitting, several petitions were presented, so that the order of proceeding seems now to be reversed; the long discussions being in the morning, and the petitions presented without discussion, being in the evening. A long and weary debate followed on the case of the Deaneries of Down and Raphoe; after which the Bill for preventing and punishing Bribery at Elections went into Committee on the motion of Lord John Russell. The bill was accordingly discussed, clause by clause, and on several of these there were divisions, but none of them were such as to alter any of the clauses of the bill; so that, as far as the Committee proceeded, the bill continued in its original shape.

The Stafford Borough Disfranchisement Bill was read a third time, and passed, and Mr. Robinson's motion on the enactment of a Property Tax, and Lord Althorp's resolutions for a commutation of Tithes, were both postponed, in consequence of the noble lord labouring under indisposition, from a severe fit of the gout.

On Tuesday, the 25th, the morning sitting was again wholly occupied with the adjourned discussion on the Cambridge Petition, relative to the admission of Dissenters into the Universities. Mr. Pryme, who was cut short in his speech on the previous day by the Speaker leaving the chair, resumed the debate this morning, and advocated the views of the petitioners. Mr. Cobbett opposed its prayer, and insisted that if the Dissenters were admitted to the Universities the Church Establishment would soon be destroyed. Mr. Bailes contended for the rights of the Dissenters to an equal participation with Churchmen in all the privileges, honours, and emoluments of the Universities. Mr. Lennard commended the Government for supporting the views of the petitioners, and expressed his conviction, that the Dissenters had neither asked, nor would desire any thing beyond what was just and reasonable. Mr. Wilks asserted that the Dissenters formed a numerical majority of the whole population of the kingdom, and were equally entitled with Churchmen to the enjoyments which they claimed.

He considered it a stigma on the nation that such men as Watt, Smith, Marshman, and Carey, were excluded from our Universities; and in the language of Mr. Locke he asked for them, "true liberty, and perfect liberty, and equal liberty." Mr. Stanley continued the morning discussion till three o'clock, by advocating the claims of the petitioners, when the Speaker left the chair.

In the evening sitting the business was extremely varied. Mr. Brocklehurst gave a long and detailed history of the formation, progress, and present condition of the South Sea Company, preparatory to a motion for dissolving the Company, and placing the control of its funds in the hands of the Government; which ended in his withdrawing his motion for a Committee, and substituting one for certain returns, as the basis of a future motion.

Leave was given to Mr S. Rice to bring in a Bill for abolishing the sinecure office of Recorder of Great Roll in the Exchequer Court of Scotland, which the holder of that office (Mr. Murray, M. P. for Leith, as we understood) had, long before any discussion had taken place on the subject, voluntarily offered to resign.

Sir Charles Burrell obtained leave to bring in a Bill to explain and amend the Act of the 2d and 3d of William the Fourth, for the better employment of labourers in agricultural parishes.

Sir James Graham, in moving the order of the day for the further consideration of the report on the new Bill for regulating the Exchequer, entered into a long statement, the object of which was to show, that though the Bill contained the enactment of a general principle, that no Controller of the Exchequer should hold any other office under and at the pleasure of the Crown, yet that he had ventured to insert a clause, making a special exception in the case of Lord Auckland, who was at present President of the Board of Trade, Receiver or Treasurer of Greenwich Hospital, a receiver of two pensions of 400*l.* and 300*l.* a-year respectively, and whom it was now proposed to make Comptroller General of the Exchequer, at a salary of 2000*l.* a-year, but in consideration of his receiving 1000*l.* a-year from Greenwich Hospital, he consented to give up his two pensions of 700*l.* a-year, making his receipts therefore only 2,300*l.* for the three offices. This arrangement was objected to, however, on principle, by Mr. Goulburn, Mr. Herries, Mr. Ruthven, Mr. Tennyson, and Col. Evans; and approved of only by Mr. Warburton, who said it had been made according to the suggestion, and with the entire approbation of Mr. Hume, who was absent, and as a matter of public economy. As Mr. Warburton was the only approver, and the objectors were numerous—for many who had not spoken against this plurality of appointment, had signified very audibly their concurrence in the sentiments of those who opposed it—Sir James Graham assigned the sense of the house as his reason for withdrawing the proposition, which was therefore abandoned, and the bill reported without the objectionable clause.

The bill for allowing Roman Catholic priests to celebrate marriages in Scotland without incurring the penalty for so doing, to which they have always been and are now still liable, went through a Committee; and this concluding the orders of the day by nine o'clock, the Speaker sat to receive such petitions as persons had been unable to present in the morning sittings, because of the interminable discussions with which these sittings had been recently engrossed, although expressly set apart for the purpose of presenting petitions without discussion at all. Accordingly, not less than 200 petitions were presented to-night, by being merely announced, and laid in heaps upon the table; on only one of which any discussion took place, and that was prolonged for a considerable time. We give the speech of the hon. member by whom it was presented, entire.

Colonel EVANS said he had now to present a petition to which he was anxious to call the serious attention of the house; but before he did so he must express his regret at the great impediments which were thrown (he did not say intentionally) in the way of those who had petitions to present in that house. He had had several petitions to present, and had come to that house 14 or 15 days without being able to get an opportunity of presenting them. This was a serious inconvenience to many members, and had this additional ill-effect—that it was often difficult to explain to parties from whom the petitions came that the delay did not originate with those to whom they had been confided. He mentioned this in the hope that some measure might be adopted in relation to the business of

the house in the morning sittings, by which, if possible, such delays might be avoided. The petition which he held in his hand was (as we understood) agreed to at a public meeting held some time ago to consider the state of the unfortunate Polish exiles now resident in this country. A society had been formed a considerable time back for the relief of those unhappy victims of despotism, and by its means relief had been afforded to an extent which went to alleviate the sufferings of many of them, but the funds of that society were now completely exhausted, and there was no resource left to the friends of those exiles but to come forward, as the petitioners now did, to entreat the sympathy and consideration of that house to their case. The petitioners truly stated that it was a duty incumbent on nations as well as on individuals to afford relief to those whose sufferings gave them a claim on their sympathy. When one individual suffered from the oppression of another, there was generally some tribunal from which the sufferer could obtain redress; but when one nation was suffering from the oppression of another, the sufferers had no remedy but in the general sympathy and compassion of those amongst their fellow men, of all nations, who abhorred such oppression. The number of Polish exiles now in England was but small—probably not more than 100; but their numbers had of late been increased by the fact that many had recently been driven from other countries in Europe, in which they had sought an asylum, by the powerful influence of the Russian court. They therefore sought our shores, where they believed they would be more free, and less exposed to any danger from Russian influence. As they had come amongst us, he did think that the peculiarity of their circumstances gave them a strong claim on the compassion and benevolence of the nation. The French Government had fully recognized the principle of giving relief from the public purse to those Polish exiles who had sought a refuge in that country, though it could not be said that France was better able, financially or politically, to grant such relief. The Government of this country had on many occasions established the principle of giving aid to foreigners who were driven by political causes to seek an asylum amongst us. Without going back to the instances in which protection and relief had been given to the Hugonots and the Flemings who had sought refuge here, he might mention that in the early part of the French war we received and pensioned a large number of refugees who were driven from that country, and in 1823 we received and relieved by public money a large body of the Spaniards who sought refuge here. It was true those Spaniards had a very strong claim upon us, as they had been engaged along with us in the contest which we had been carrying on against the ruler of France, but in his opinion the Polish exiles at present amongst us had almost as strong a claim. We were, as contracting parties to the treaty of Vienna, in some sort guarantees of the Government which was at that time established in Poland. No doubt a war had followed, which for a time put an end to that government; but he believed, that though the Polish nation could not send envoys to the courts of Europe, or that, as she was circumstanced, any such envoys distinct from the Russian Government in Poland could be received in any of the European courts, yet that the Polish nation had found means to make to several of the European courts strong complaints of the tyranny under which they groaned, before they had attempted by open force to shake off that tyranny. Under these circumstances, he did think that those members of the Polish nation who had sought an asylum amongst us had very strong claims upon us as a nation. It was too well known that the dominating influence of Russia in the courts of Europe was every day becoming more serious (hear, hear); and though he would not say that we had yielded to that influence, yet he must assert that the present Government, and still more their predecessors in office, had deferred more to it than was becoming in the Government of these kingdoms. (Hear, hear.) The Poles had a strong claim upon this country, and we were bound to assist them, if it were only to show to the rest of Europe that we were completely free from any share of influence from the cabinet of St. Petersburg. (Hear, hear.)

The petition was seconded by Sir Harry Verney, and supported by Mr. Sinclair; when Lord Palmerston rose to express his full participation in the sympathy expressed for the sufferings of the Polish exiles; but at the same time to say that as a minister of the crown, he could not hold out any expectation of relief being granted, according to the prayer of the petitioners. Mr. O'Connell

made an admirable speech on behalf of the Poles, in which he dwelt forcibly on Russian cruelty, and exposed the treacherous conduct of Louis Phillippe in the present policy of France. Mr. T. Attwood spoke at great length in the same strain, and went over the whole question of our foreign diplomacy and relations. Sir Samuel Whalley regretted to hear the objections made by Lord Palmerston, denying relief to the sufferers; and Lord Dudley Stuart, who has always taken the warmest interest on behalf of the Polish exiles, made a very long and feeling speech on their behalf.

Mr. Buckingham said he did not rise to prolong but to terminate a discussion which he thought had already been sufficiently extended for all practical purposes. He begged only to offer his cordial concurrence in the prayer of the petition, and to express his conviction that no case of urgent distress ever came before the House more entitled to its attention than that of the unhappy petitioners. It could hardly be expected, that His Majesty's Ministers would, on the mere presentation of a petition, offer to give the assistance prayed for; and therefore it was that he regretted the extent of the discussion, on the mere question of whether the petition should be received or not, for the only issue of all this debate would be, that the petition would be ordered "to lie upon the table." Instead of wasting our strength and exhausting public sympathy and attention, by discussions of this nature, that could lead to no practical result, he hoped some hon. member would give notice of a substantive motion soon after Easter, recommending the House or the Crown to give relief to the Polish exiles, when we could put the professions of those who affect compassion for them to the test, and see whether these professions were a mere lip-service offered to the cause of liberty and humanity, or whether they would confirm by their votes, the wishes for the relief of the Poles which they so loudly express by their tongues.

Mr. Spring Rice said, that the Government were not unwilling to grant relief in cases where they could do so without violating a great public principle, and instanced a recent case in which relief had been afforded to 150 exiles driven by stress of weather into Harwich, but he decidedly objected to a grant of the nature proposed by the petition.

The discussion then ended, by the question being put "That the Petition do lie upon the table," which was the only issue of the long debate; and after some other Petitions were presented without discussion, the House adjourned.

On Wednesday, the 26th, the morning sitting was again entirely consumed in a third days' debate on the Cambridge Petition, which continuing till three o'clock, the Speaker left the chair, as, by the rules established when the morning sittings were first instituted, he cannot put any question to the vote after three o'clock: so that as no morning discussion can be resumed in the evening, and as there would be no morning sitting again until after the holidays (as the House would adjourn this evening), this three days' debate now stands adjourned over, till after the Easter holidays, for nearly three weeks, when the only question then to be decided is, not whether Dissenters shall or shall not enter the Universities (which would have been well worthy the debate), but merely whether the Petition shall lie upon the table! a question, about which there is no dispute, and which might have been settled after the speech of the hon. member who presented it. The debate of to-day was opened by Sir Robert Inglis, in a very dull and heavy speech. He was followed by Mr. O'Connell, who made an excellent one, perhaps the best that has yet been delivered on the subject. Mr. F. Shaw succeeded him; and was followed by Lord Palmerston, who was not so happy as usual: and Sir Robert Peel closed by a reply to Mr. Spring Rice's speech of three days ago, rather than by addressing himself to the main question. His speech was very animated, though very fallacious; but it contained some good points, and some very curious historical details. Mr. Rice had objected to the authority under which Dissenters were excluded from the University, because it had emanated from King James the First, who had written a book on Demonology, and had set up Queen Elizabeth as his model of ecclesiastical toleration and authority. Sir Robert read from an act passed in the reign of Elizabeth, not merely a recognition of the existence of demons and witches, but enactments for the punishment of those who exercised the arts of enchantment, and caused men's bodies to waste away, and their goods and chattels to disappear, by sentencing the practisers of this enchantment and witchcraft to imprisonment and the pillory

for the first offence, and hanging for the second; while even the great Lord Bacon believed that *witches* delighted to feed on human flesh, and endeavoured to account for their so doing by the hypothesis, that human flesh sent up peculiar odours, which entering the brain, stimulated the imagination, in the exercise of which he said it was well known that witchcraft peculiarly delighted.

There is no doubt that it is perfectly possible, and matter of universal experience, that men of the largest powers of mind, and the soundest understanding on all matters coming within the range of reason, may and do entertain notions the most extraordinary and even absurd, on matters of religious faith or superstition, as witness the early philosophers of Egypt, of Greece, of Rome, and of India. But this very circumstance ought to make us more tolerant towards each other on small matters of difference not capable of decision by reason only—and induce us to ask, whether many of the opinions that men now hold on matters of theology and faith, of church government and discipline, may not, in a few centuries hence, appear to our posterity, quite as absurd as those of Queen Elizabeth and Lord Bacon, on the powers and diet of enchanters and witches. If so, let us abate our pride and confidence in our own opinions, and allow the possibility of others being quite as near the truth as ourselves, though the difference between us may be as great as between the Lord High Chancellor of England when Bacon sat upon the woolsack, and the Lord High Chancellor of England when Brougham occupies the same seat of eminence and authority. Whatever is false in the opinions of either, time and increased knowledge will destroy; whatever is true in the belief of the one or of the other, will endure through all time, and be confirmed by eternity.

In the evening, the House met at five, and received various petitions, which had been accumulating during the protracted mornings' discussions; and after the transaction of some routine business, the House adjourned for the Easter holidays, to meet again on Monday, the 14th of April next.

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR.

### OPINION OF LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S MARRIAGE BILL FOR THE DISSENTERS.

SIR,

Newport, Monmouth, March 18, 1834.

A petition has this day been transmitted from the Dissenters of this place to our worthy Member, for presentation; and also one from the Baptist Congregation, having in view the same object. The former was agreed to at a very numerous meeting, and has nearly 800 signatures; comprising those of the Mayor, an Alderman, the Catholic Priests, the Dissenting Ministers, several Merchants, and a large number of respectable tradesmen. We hope the House will distinctly notice that clause of our Congregational petition which states, in reference to Lord John Russell's Bill, that *no measure can be at all satisfactory to us, which allows the endowed Clergy to grant us Licences, to publish our Banns, or in any other way to interfere in our Marriages*. This wretched Bill will probably be withdrawn. Its object appears to us to be twofold—first, to declare the Dissenters to be an inferior *caste* to the Church—secondly, to place our Clergy in a state of degrading subordination to theirs. We have yet to learn in what respect we are inferior to Churchmen, in any of the qualities requisite to constitute good and loyal subjects; and I we are far from being convinced that our Clergy are inferior to theirs in morality, piety, talent, and usefulness. To be so treated from the usages of a more barbarous period, and the enactments of more despotic governments is bad enough; but to be so treated in a Bill introduced by those who call themselves friends of Liberty and of Dissenters, is intolerable. Unless the Ministry will deal out to us justice in a less niggardly and more gracious manner, the Dissenters will, we think, be justified in devoting their whole energy to the severance of Church and State, with sleepless vigilance and untiring perseverance, till it is achieved. Desiring for you health to prosecute to a successful issue, the various important objects in which you are engaged,

I am, Sir, Yours very respectfully,

A DISSENTER.

# OPINIONS OF A NAVAL CAPTAIN ON THE IMPRESSMENT OF SEAMEN.

SIR,

*Sittingbourne, March 10, 1834.*

It is to be regretted that no one member of the House replied to Sir J. Graham's praise of *impressed seamen* for having gained the victories of the Nile, Trafalgar, &c. (which was only proving that an English *slave* is a better man than a French or Spanish *slave*), by recounting the names of our ships carried into the ports of our enemies by *impressed men*. Such instances as the *Hermione*, *Danæ*, *Dominica*, &c.

I will recount you a story.—In 1804, the *Hippomenes* sloop of war, commanded by Captain Shipley, manned by impressed seamen of all nations, fell in with *L'Egyptienne*, French frigate, in the West Indies. The gallant Captain knowing of what materials his crew was composed, promised them their discharge if they captured the enemy, which they did. On arrival at Barbadoes Sir Samuel Hood promoted Captain S. for his gallant conduct, but by some accident, the promise to the crew was forgotten. Upon the sloop going to sea, under the command of one of the bravest officers in the service, Captain Kenneth M'Kenzie, she fell in with a French privateer brig, *Le Buonaparte*, of very inferior force, which not only defeated, but nearly captured the *Hippomenes*, who left her First Lieutenant, Purser, and nine men, on the decks of the enemy, and her Captain desperately wounded in the mizzen chains of his own ship.

Captain Elliott, the Secretary of the Admiralty, entered into a rigmarole, so-phisticating the question, talking of volunteers. Shall I tell you what the volunteers of Captain Elliott consisted of.—*Impressed men*, who, on arriving on board, were told, *Now we shall keep you whether you enter or not, and the same penalty awaits you if you attempt to desert, but the difference will be this, if you say you enter, a bounty of five pounds.* So much for men entering voluntarily. The eloquent Captain stated the few desertions from his own ship, but he did not add, *She was one of the finest frigates in the service, employed upon the most agreeable station, as yacht to my father, the Governor-General of India, always selected for that service, which yielded the greatest share of pleasure and profit.* Would it have been thus on the North Sea station? I have known Captains boast of no desertions, when they put suspected men into irons at sun-set, and kept a guard boat rowing round the ship all night!!

Our present race of seamen are the refuse of all trades and professions. A parent will not send his son to sea, till every thing else has failed, because the word *press-gang* is hanging in terror over him.

The Admiralty must appoint efficient officers to our own ships, offer the same bounty as given to recruits for *limited service*, indemnify seamen for the sacrifices they are called upon to make on quitting the Merchant's service for the King's, before they *think* of impressment. It is sophistry to be telling us that Merchants would offer an exorbitant price for seamen on the breaking out of war. Merchants could not send their ships to sea, neither could they effect insurance, till the Fleet was manned. The shepherd will not bring his sheep out of the fold till the wolf is driven away.

Conscription is fairer than impress; when people will not pay in their *persons* they must pay in their *purses*.

Captain Elliott is for impress, "because Russia, Spain, Portugal, and the Bey of Tunis, has it," but he is mistaken; their system is more like conscription, the hardship does not fall upon one class, and that class the only one which derives no benefit from those institutions they are the principal instruments of maintaining. What becomes of English liberty without our seamen, and what enjoyment do they derive from this liberty?

Go on and Prosper,

A CAPTAIN R. N.

## PUBLIC FEELING ON THE SUBJECT OF THE IMPRESSMENT OF SEAMEN.

SIR,

*Dublin, March 8, 1834.*

I see with indignation and regret the result of Mr. Buckingham's motion for "a Select Committee to enquire into the practicability of devising some plan as a substitute for forcible impressment." Nothing deserving the name of argument was opposed to the motion, and the taunting the hon. mover with the moderation of his tone, on introducing the subject to the House, may serve as a salutary hint, for, however strong that hon. gentleman's language out of the House may have been on the subject, or whatever the sentiments of those within, the public voice, the voice, the feelings of every man of humanity, of every man pretending to a sense of justice out of doors, will support him in the strongest language of reprobation he can make use of on the subject within. What, Sir, are all the graces of eloquence to be enlisted in exciting us to war, on principles of justice, honour, and so forth, when the means of carrying on that war are often a violation of justice and humanity beyond anything which we propose to redress; and shall not the warmest language of indignant, outraged feeling be awakened in reprobation of the atrocious system of forcible impressment? I consider every man who supports the system as accountable for its consequences, and if any man forcibly impressed loses his life as the result, I hold every individual aiding and abetting in the act as morally guilty of murder. If what we go to war for be worth fighting for, it is worth paying those who do fight,—if it is not, why then do we go to war? But it is monstrous that those who have the stake of great properties in the country, for the sake of a paltry fraction in the payment of the sailor, would stain their possessions with the sailor's blood.

JUSTITIA.

## TESTIMONY OF A MARITIME CAPTAIN AS TO IMPRESSMENT DRIVING OUR SEAMEN TO AMERICA.

SIR,

*Liverpool, March 8, 1834.*

I SEE by the public prints you have been advocating the interests of your fellow-seamen. I have not yet read your speech on the subject, but as a seaman and an Englishman, knowing the tendency of the diabolical system of Impressment, I can, from a knowledge of the fact, state that, if the Government will not render to the seaman the rights of fellow-subjects, they will, in case of another war, have enemies in this class of men, more to be dreaded than Europe in arms.

To prove this, I may mention the following fact: Last American war, being in the command of a merchant ship, I was taken by the privateer schooner, the *Whig*, of Baltimore (thanks to our lubberly Government in taking our letters of marque and gun licences from us). At the time of my capture she was returning off her cruise of six months, having then a crew on board of one hundred and fifteen seamen, seventy-eight of whom were British, and equal to two hundred of such as the remainder were composed of. One of my countrymen, a fine fellow, was quarter-master of this privateer; I asked him how he could fight against his country! he said if I would listen to his case, I should have his reasons and apology.

He told me he was married in Liverpool, and soon after impressed; he then borrowed 80*l.*, the sum required for two substitutes, and got a certificate that he had them serving for him, which procured his discharge. He then slipped himself on board a merchant vessel, and sailed for Liverpool; but falling in with Admiral Dixon's squadron, at the mouth of the Channel, he was again impressed (*his protection being of no use to him*), and in a frigate of that squadron he proceeded to the coast of America, when he deserted, and went into the American merchant service. Here he got as much money as kept his wife and children from the poor-house in England, and ultimately he had them brought to him at



Norfolk, in Virginia. His tale being ended, he asked me what I would have done, if like him I had nothing to do on shore for subsistence for my wife and children? I shook hands with him, and candidly told him I should have been glad, under similar circumstances, to have done the same, for the wretch who does not love his wife and children more than all the world, is a disgrace to his country and to his species. After the peace I saw the same individual in Liverpool; when he came to me, I told him I was glad to see him, but begged of him to claim no acquaintance with me, being afraid, if the affair became known, that I might be called upon as an evidence against him; so much for the odious impress service.

When in America, in the state of Rhode Island, there was only one privateer, and before I left (at the peace), many were on the stocks and fitting out, all the way from Newport to Providence, and almost within hail of each other. The Americans used to say, "Give us twelve months' longer war, and we will fight you with your own men," and such would have been the case. The farce of hanging British seamen for being taken in the American service was attempted at Halifax; but it being well known that the Americans would have retaliated, the matter ended. Let our statesmen remember that America is still a refuge for the oppressed, and that she can do much more than she has done yet. Great Britain, through the Corn Laws and other evils, is shorn of her strength—that our commercial marine is decaying, and nothing keeps them up but hopes of better times. Whether those times will ever come, remains to be seen; but while we have so many uninformed Legislators in our maritime nation, it is hardly to be expected.

I am, dear Sir, with the greatest respect,

Your brother sailor and well wisher,

JOHN SMITH.

#### IMPRESSMENT—DISSENTERS' GRIEVANCES—CORN LAWS, AND COMMERCE.

SIR,

*Yorkshire, March 12, 1834.*

I cannot resist the inclination of writing to you, to add my mite of congratulation on the success of your speech on the abolition of Impressment. With characteristic honesty of purpose our excellent member voted for your motion, and that you will eventually succeed in your object I cannot doubt, notwithstanding the paltry attempt of Ministers to supersede your motion by an unworthy substitute of their own. Neither their plan nor their manœuvre will do them any credit with the country, and both will eventually be defeated.

It is gratifying to see so signal a reformation in the manners of the House of Commons; it no longer resembles "a bear-garden or cock-pit." The school-master has been abroad to some purpose, and the application of the rod has had the most salutary effects.

I begin to think Ministers are behind the age in enterprize and spirit, as in Lord Russell's Bill for the relief of Dissenters in the article of marriage, their moderation and commendable virtue in a ministry when rightly understood, wears the semblance of meanness, and possesses all the intrinsic characters of poverty of spirit. The manlier part would be sturdily to withhold relief at all, rather than to cheat the expectants with any thing so shadowy and unsubstantial. They no doubt have no sympathy with the Dissenters, but in doing out their benevolence they should have some little regard at least for their own characters! It is astonishing to see them so bent on playing into the hands of their enemies. But the real truth seems to be, that with the exception of Grey and Brougham, the Cabinet consists of second and third-rate men; and were it not that the country is fearful of radical counsels flinging us back again into the arms of Toryism, we should soon see an end of the Grey Administration.

The debate on the Corn Question interested me highly. All theory is on the side of Hume and his partizans: and the present low price of corn is favourable to the substitution of a moderate fixed duty in lieu of the present moveable scale of duties on importation. But the fear is, that the change would not alter the

determination of Prussia and France to exclude British manufactures, and establish their own. They see plainly that Britain became wealthy, by the reciprocal benefits of an agricultural and manufacturing population, independent of foreign commerce, and intend to follow her example. That being the case, little advantage would accrue from an alteration of our present system; for bread is cheap enough for all the purposes of commerce, considering that we have machinery which does the work of eight million hands, and that steam-engines consume no corn! As it is, our only hope of salvation is—thanks to your patriotic labours—the Star that has risen in the East. If, however, the trade with India or China fall short of your expectations, it is quite clear that our machinery will throw our operatives on the parishes; and our capital will become a stagnant pool, engendering “monsters and chimeras dire;” and Britain will share the fate of Venice or Genoa, and the cities of the Eastern world, which you have so often held up as beacons to warn us from the career of destruction.

Yours, most truly,

AMICUS.

### PREVENTION OF DUELLING.

SIR,

*Gloucester, March 23, 1834.*

The newspapers inform me, that you are about to propose some measures in Parliament for preventing the practice of duelling. I wish you every success in the undertaking; but it is an arduous one, perhaps, impracticable; however, I consider the practice would receive considerable check, if, whenever the original aggressor destroyed his antagonist, he should be deemed a *premeditated murderer*, and punished accordingly.

Your's, Sir,

BELISARIUS.

### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BEST MODE OF REGULATING THE DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

It appears to the Committee to be impossible to attain the object in view by any of the various plans which have been submitted to them, for taking the Divisions by a system of Tickets or Cards, with the names of the Members voting inscribed upon them. The difficulty of ensuring that Members shall be provided beforehand with these Cards, so as to avoid confusion or delay when the Division is about to take place, and the additional difficulty of collecting these Cards from the Members present, when combined with the necessity of identifying the individual presenting the Card, in order to prevent the possibility of one name being substituted for another, induced the Committee to reject all Plans founded upon this basis, and to direct their inquiries into a different channel.

To call over the whole House, upon each Division; and to enter the Names of the Members present, would have occasioned a loss of time, which the Committee did not feel themselves justified in recommending.

It was suggested, indeed, that all Members entering the House should inscribe their names in a book, on each successive day of the Session, and that the names thus inscribed should alone be called over, in the event of a Division; but as no provision was suggested for cases where a Division of great importance was followed by a Division of minor importance, and where the original list of 300 or 400 Members became applicable to a Division of 50 or 60 Members, the Committee felt that such a regulation would be attended with much inconvenience, and consequently could not adopt it.

The scantiness of the accommodation afforded by the present buildings of the House, prevented the Committee from suggesting, as they would otherwise have been inclined to do, that, upon every Division, the Ayes and the Noes should be sent forth into two different Lobbies, and the names of the Members taken down simultaneously as they re-entered the House by opposite doors.

The Committee beg, however, to state, that if the House should feel disposed, at any future time, to build an additional Lobby in the vacant space at the east end of the House, there is no plan which, in their judgment, combines so many recommendations as this, or might so easily be carried into effect.

Under existing circumstances, and with a regard to existing localities, the Committee must content themselves with submitting to the House the following Propositions :

1. That in all Divisions, both of the House and in Committee, the presumed Minority be directed to go forth into the Lobby as at present, and all the remaining Members to take their seats in the body of the House.

2. That two Tellers be appointed to stand on the floor of the House, accompanied by two Clerks.

3. That one of these Clerks, commencing, as now, at the end of the back bench, shall call aloud the name of each Member in succession, which shall be entered by the other Clerk on a paper or pasteboard, with lines ruled, and numbered ; the Tellers counting, as the Clerks proceed, and communicating to the Clerk the result.

4. That so soon as the Members within the House are counted, the Tellers and Clerks shall proceed to the Lobby Doors, and that one Clerk shall call, and the other take down, on similar paper, the name of each Member as he comes into the House ; the Tellers counting, and announcing the result, as at present.

5. That the lists thus taken be brought up to the table by the Tellers, and deposited there for insertion in the Votes.

The Committee have ascertained, by experiment, that thirty names can be called over and entered, in one minute, in short-hand ; but Mr. Joseph Gurney, on his examination, stated it to be his impression that a quick long-hand writer, with the help of such occasional abbreviations as practice would suggest, would take down the names very nearly as fast as he could, in short-hand, himself ; and might, certainly, enter twenty-five names in a minute. The Committee will assume twenty names to be the maximum, and allow five minutes for each 100 names. In this case, a Division of 400 Members would occupy twenty minutes, which is very little more than is required under the present system ; the average time consumed in counting 100 Members, (taken on a mean of those who go out, and those who remain in the House,) being from three to four minutes.

Now, if the principle of publicity be worth any sacrifice at all, it is certainly worth so small a sacrifice as this ; nor does the Committee believe that, under any conceivable system, a much greater degree of expedition can be combined with that accuracy, which it is essential to ensure, where the Votes are published with the sanction of the Speaker's name.

The Committee do not anticipate any difficulty in finding Clerks sufficiently well acquainted with the persons of Members to call the name of each Member in succession, as proposed ; but, in the very rare cases where such difficulty might occur, it would be removed instantly by the interference of the Tellers, or of the Member himself.

### PROPOSED ADDRESS TO THE CROWN FOR THE RELIEF OF THE EXILED POLES.

At the morning sitting of Wednesday, the 26th, Mr. Buckingham gave notice that on Thursday, the 24th of April, he would submit to the House the following Resolution, the consent of the Chancellor of the Exchequer having been previously asked and obtained to the motion being submitted, though without any pledge as to the course which might be taken by Ministers when the question should come under discussion.

“ That an humble Address be presented to the Crown, praying His Majesty to extend his royal bounty to the exiled Poles, now suffering under great privations in this country, and pledging this House to make good to His Majesty such sum as he may be graciously pleased to appropriate to their relief.”

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

### MINORITY OF 65.

Tellers included, who, on the 19th of March, voted for the amendment of Mr. Bethell, on the Bill for disfranchising the Freemen of Liverpool, that the Sons of the Freemen, not yet enfranchised, should not be included in the operations of this Bill, but be allowed to take up their freedom and their vote as they become of age:

Arbuthnot, Hon. H.	Finch, G.	Herries, J. C.	Norreys, Lord
Banks, W. J.	Forester, Hon. C. W.	Hodgson, J.	Patten, J.
Baring, H. B.	Freemantle, Sir T.	Hope, H. T.	Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir R.
Baring, F. T.	Gaskell, J. M.	Howard, P. H.	Pigot, R.
Bentinck, Lord G.	Gladstone, W. E.	Hughes, H.	Reid, Sir J. R.
Blackstone, W. S.	Gladstone, T.	Inglis, Sir R.	Ross, C.
Briggs, R.	Gordon, Hon. Capt.	Iton, S.	Shaw, F.
Bruce, Lord E.	Goulburn, H.	James, W.	Somerset, Lord G.
Calcraft, J.	Grimston, Lord	Labouchere, H.	Stanley, E.
Campbell, Sir H. P.	Halcomb, J.	Lincoln, Earl of	Stormont, Viscount
Castlereagh, Viscount	Halford, H.	Lyll, G.	Trevor, Hon. G. R.
Chetwynd, Captain	Hammer, Sir J.	Lygon, Hon. H. B.	Willoughby, Sir H.
Conolly, Colonel	Hardinge, Sir H.	Marryat, J.	Wood, Colonel T.
Corry, Hon. H. L.	Hawkes, T.	Meynell, Captain	Wynn, Rt. Hon. C. W.
Egerton, W. T.	Henniker, Lord	Nicholl, J.	Young, J.
Estcourt, T. G. B.	Herbert, Hon. S.		

TELLERS,——Sandon, Lord.——Bethell, R.

### MINORITY OF 20,

Teller included, who, on the 24th of April, voted against the clause of the Bribery at Elections Bill, directing the appointment of Nominees on Election Committees of the House of Commons.

Attwood, T.	Chetwynd, Captain	Hardy, J.	Torrens, Colonel
Blackstone, W. S.	Evans, W.	Hayes, Sir E.	Walter, J.
Briggs, R.	Ewart, W.	Philips, M.	Wason, R.
Brotherton, J.	Gaskell, J. M.	Romilly, J.	Wynn, Rt. Hon. W. W.
Bruce, Lord E.	Halcomb, J.	Sinclair, G.	

TELLER,——Aglionby, H. A.

### MINORITY OF 24,

Tellers included, who, on the 24th of March, voted in favour of Major Beauclerk's Motion, to strike out of the Ordnance Estimates 28,000*l.*, being this year's instalment of 245,505*l.* still remaining to be paid for completing the works of Nova Scotia, Halifax Citadel, Kingston Fortification, and Mauritius Citadel.

#### ENGLAND.

Aglionby, H. A.	Faithfull, G.	Kennedy, J.	Potter, R.
Attwood, T.	Fielden, J.	Morrison, J.	Scholefield, J.
Cobbett, W.	Humphrey, J.	Pease, J.	Trelawney, Sir W. S.
Evans, Colonel	Hutt, W.	Philips, M.	Wason, R.
Ewart, W.			

#### IRELAND.

O'Connell, D.	Ruthven, E. S.	Vigers, N. A.	Walker, C. A.
Roche, W.			

TELLERS,——Beauclerk, Major.——Buller, C.

SHUT OUT——Brotherton, J.

## COMPLAINTS OF IRREGULARITY IN THE DELIVERY OF THE PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SEVERAL complaints have been transmitted to us as to the irregularity of delivery in this REVIEW, which induces us to take this method of assuring our Readers, that on no occasion whatever has the publication of it been delayed beyond the day fixed, namely, the evening of Friday, though on some occasions it has been ready on the morning of that day. If there be any London Booksellers who inform their Country correspondents that the work is not out, or can not be had in good time for the dispatch of their Friday's parcels, they must labour under a mistake, and must intend to speak of some other work, and not THE PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW, which is ready for every Bookseller in London on Friday morning; and which is delivered, to our own knowledge, at the two extremities of London on Friday evening, and is in Manchester and other large towns, at a distance of 200 miles from London, on the afternoon of Saturday, and at places of less distance on the evening of Friday. All instances of late delivery must be attributable to neglect, therefore, in some quarters beyond correction.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF COUNTRY AGENTS.

THE establishment of Agents at the large Provincial Towns is for the purpose of forming Depots, at which the Work may be always had by the smaller Booksellers who do not receive Weekly Parcels from London; but no such Agency can be worth establishing unless at least one hundred copies are taken weekly; in which case the Agency will be granted. The List of Booksellers who receive Weekly Parcels from London, and through whom THE REVIEW is supplied, does not include a fourth of the number of those to whom it is actually sent; but the Editor will readily add any other names that may be forwarded to him, either from England, Scotland, or Ireland, to make that List complete.

## MOTION ON DRUNKENNESS.

FROM an error of the press, the date of the motion for a Committee to devise legislative measures for preventing the further spread of this great national evil was inaccurately given. It is fixed for TUESDAY, the 20th of May, and not FRIDAY, as stated in our last. It is a remarkable coincidence, unknown to us at the time of selecting this date, that it is the day on which the Great Anniversary of "THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY" is to be held in the Metropolis; the Bishop of London, as Patron of the Society, having promised to take the Chair on that occasion.

## THE EASTER RECESS.

WE shall continue, during the Easter Recess, to occupy our pages with Parliamentary and Political articles, having reference to the most important topics of the day, among which we may enumerate particularly, the Questions of the Separation of Church and State, Revision of our whole System of Taxation, Employment and Provision for the Poor, Reciprocal Free Trade with France, the Foreign Policy and Relations of Great Britain, &c. A Biographical and Characteristic sketch of Sir James Graham, the First Lord of the Admiralty, will be given in our Next: and one of the Lord Chief Justice Denman, the last created peer, will follow in a succeeding Number.

## GREEK AND LATIN.

AN experienced Teacher of the Greek and Latin Languages, who has been successful in promoting the improvement of his Pupils, and who possesses skill in Versification and Composition, offers his services to Young Gentlemen destined for the Public Schools or the Universities. He has resided in Seminaries of the first repute, and likewise attended families of the highest respectability and distinction. Address, post paid, to M. F. at Mr. Marriott's, 12, Wakefield Street, Regent Square.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW

—SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1834.

SIR JAMES GRAHAM, BART., FIRST LORD OF THE  
ADMIRALTY, AND M.P. FOR CUMBERLAND.

SIR JAMES GRAHAM is descended from a Scotch family of the name of GRAHAME, which settled in Cumberland during the last century. His father obtained an English Baronetcy in 1782, as Sir James Graham of Netherby. He sat for Ripon in 1796, posterior to the general election, and was again twice returned without opposition—namely in 1802 and 1806—for the same borough.

The present baronet was born in 1792: he is consequently in his forty-second year. Paternally as well as maternally he is connected with Scotland. His mother was Lady Catherine Stewart, daughter of the Earl of Galloway; and his own lady was Miss Fanny Callander, daughter of James Campbell, Esq. of Ardinglass. Thus is he trebly tied to “the land of cakes.”

Of the early history of the present baronet we know little or nothing. We believe he was for a time at Eton, and towards 1811 was removed to Oxford. At the University he was remarkable for quickness, intelligence, and a gay and social disposition. He eagerly engaged in all the manly sports of his college companions. Hunting, shooting, &c., were among his favourite pastimes; nor was he averse from those other enjoyments which reward and sweeten toil.

At the end of 1814, or the beginning of 1815, Sir James left the University: he was regretted by all who knew him. At this period he was remarkable not alone for the manly beauty of his person, but for a frankness and generosity of disposition which endeared him to all his friends. His abilities were also of no common order, and, altogether, he created every where a strong sensation in his favour. His wine parties were as renowned as his popularity, but at the end of these enjoyments there is always an unpleasant reckoning, and this the young baronet had to pay at some cost. The old baronet, who made his son an ample allowance, was naturally enough disconcerted at the length of these bills. Somebody good-naturedly said, “But, Sir James, your son is a clever young man—a fine youth—he is twice your size;—(the old baronet was a short man)—nay, he could almost

put you in his pocket." "I know not how that may be," replied the old gentleman, "but this I certainly do know, and to my great cost, too, that he is never out of mine."

After the peace of 1815, the Continent—which had been hitherto shut to Sir James Graham—became again opened, and he availed himself of this opportunity of foreign travel. He remained abroad for three or four years, diligently availing himself of the advantages to be derived from an observation of foreign manners and customs, and returned to England about 1818. Soon after, he was elected for the town of Carlisle, which he continued to represent in four successive Parliaments. In 1819 Sir James was united to his present lady, and for a considerable period afterwards he resided almost altogether in the country among his tenantry, performing the duties of a country gentleman and magistrate with zeal and ability.

The relation between landlord and tenant is one of reciprocal benefit, and when properly appreciated in the relation of common duties and common interests, it is one in which some of the finest feelings of our nature greatly subserve the most imperious national interests. The most important establishments of English polity are dependant on the land for support—the Ministers of the Established Church derive their revenues from the land—the poor, the aged, and the infirm have a legal claim on the soil—the injured or oppressed, who cannot obtain justice for themselves, or punish the wrong-doer at their own expense, cast the burden on the land, and the County Rate affords to them at least the means of an ample if not a speedy redress. Thus is the land made to minister to Religion, Charity, and Justice; and when the proprietor of the soil—the dispenser, in his corporate capacity, of these three blessings—is moreover individually loved for his private virtues and public qualities, the hold which he has on his tenantry is one in which affection and interest alike mingle. Perhaps this is not the place, and certainly it is not the age, in which to vaunt of those feudal feelings—of that traditional respect in which families who have been good landlords have been handed down by tenants from generation to generation—but however it may be out of place, or out of time, we cannot but echo the sentiment of Lord Bacon, "that it is a reverend thing to see an ancient castle or building not in decay, as to see a fair timber tree sound and perfect: how much more to behold an ancient noble family which hath stood against the waves and weathers of time? for a new nobility is the act of power, but ancient nobility is the act of time." Though feelings of this kind are fast hastening to decay in England, as well as in all parts of the old world, and though they have never had existence in the new, he would be a bold man who should say that they had not their uses; and that they did not give rise to local attachments—to fond friendships—and to some of the nobler and more masculine virtues of the human heart. The feudal system has long perished in England—it was destroyed in Prussia in 1806, by the Minister, Stein, who by one stroke of his pen emancipated the *Bauer Shaftern*—it was abolished in 1818 in Mecklenburgh—and it now exists but in Russia, Poland, and parts of Hungary; yet the system, faulty as it was, was the parent of much generous and noble feeling, and he must be a man of strong prejudices against antiquity who can see nothing but unmixed evil in an institution which in the

dark ages had its uses—and to which even in modern times much generous and grateful feeling was incident. We boast much of the civilization and enlightenment of present times—but looking to the condition of the Agricultural districts at this moment, as detailed in the Reports on the Poor Laws, published by the authority of his Majesty's Ministers—looking to the fact that the ties between parent and child are nearly severed—and that illegitimate children are twenty-five per cent. more valuable than legitimate—we very much doubt if the feudal system, with all its vices, was much worse, in some respects, than the modern mal-administration of laws absolutely good in themselves, but perverted to the worst uses by Overseers and Guardians.

Be this, however, as it may, there is no part of England in which the feelings consequent on the feudal system, have more sway than in the counties. There, the link-connecting lord and clansman is yet broken, or if broken, the mark of the chain still subsists. But our readers will say, wherefore this digression? what has it to do with Sir James Graham? Much more than may at first sight appear. These feelings have “grown with the growth, and strengthened with the strength” of the Cumberland baronet; they were the prop and pabulum on which he was “nursed and dandled into manhood”—to them we owe the famous pamphlet “Corn and Currency,” first published in 1828—to them we owe the “Letters of a Cumberland Yeoman,” alluded to in the late debate on the Corn Laws, by Mr. Poulett Thomson—and to them we owe, last though not least, the speech of Sir James Graham, as the champion of the landed interest, delivered on the night of the debate on Mr. Hume's motion.

From the period of his return to Parliament till the publication of “Corn and Currency,” Sir James had been hardly known in the House. He rarely attended the debates, and still more rarely spoke. When he did venture to address the “assembled wisdom of the nation,” (to use one of the phrases of the late Lord Londonderry) it was on some question connected with the landed interest. As we before observed, his duties as a country gentleman and a landlord, engrossed a great part of his time and attention; and he was moreover known to be a passionate follower of the chase. To such a being, no place is a greater desert—even with all its attractions—than the great “wen” called London, and few places are more uninteresting than the House of Commons. Yet some of our very best speakers and debaters have been country gentlemen. The late Mr. George Ponsonby, the leader of the Opposition, was the most relentless hunter of his day; and he generally entered the House in buckskins and top boots—yet it would be difficult to find a man who possessed in a higher degree the various qualities required for an Opposition leader. As a general debater he was unrivalled; and as a shrewd, active, and practical man of business, he beat all his contemporaries hollow. There was no more pleasing speaker than Sir Francis Burdett in his best day—he was generally eloquent—always clear, if not well-informed, and altogether a general favourite; yet he is also a most resolute and determined fox-hunter—And if another instance were wanting to support our theory, we might adduce the Right Hon. Baronet, the member for Cumberland. We do not say that any of these three gentlemen naturally, and at once, liked the House of Commons—on the contrary, we believe, the reverse—and



it is not perhaps, going too far to assume, that had their first successes been failures, not one of them would have taken that interest in public life, which each and all of them afterwards took.

It was soon seen that the then member for Carlisle, and the present representative for Cumberland—although a considerable landholder, was not one of the *fruges consumere nati* class. His address to the landowners already placed him among the foremost ranks of that body, and when he rose in the House, in the session of 1828-9, he was listened to with attention and respect. This was certainly a just homage to his zeal and abilities in the interest of his order; for he was the first large proprietor (we do not of course allude to Mr. Cobbett, for he, as a public writer, had for more than twenty years previously, propagated similar doctrines), who proclaimed that all tithes fall exclusively on the agricultural interest; and that the aggregate burdens on land amounted then, at the least, to eighteen millions annually. In truth, it was impossible to deny many of Sir James's statements; the land tax alone had been collected at the rate of 4s. in the pound; and it might be calculated to amount to 10 per cent. on the rent throughout the kingdom. The Poor, County, and Highway Rates, the exclusive burdens of the land, manifested a decided tendency to increase. Even the progress of civilization and improvement then fell, as it now does, on the owners of the soil. Not a new bridge was built—not a new communication was opened—not a road repaired, without adding somewhat to the direct burdens on the land; and as if to “cap the climax” of the squires' misery by an act passed in the session of 1827, individuals were almost altogether relieved from the expenses of criminal prosecutions, and the County Rates were made responsible for the prosecutor's bill of costs, not only at the sessions, but also at the assizes, even in cases of misdemeanour. This was, indeed, *ingens diraque cohors malorum*.

But these miseries were trivial in comparison to the effect of Mr. Peel's bill of 1819. At the period of the passing of this measure, Mr. Ricardo, then the organ of the funded and monied interest, contended that the depreciation caused by this measure amounted only to 3 per cent.; but before his death, in 1823, he admitted that that bill had raised the Currency at least 10 per cent. Mr. Matthias Aftwood, and the present Secretary-at-War, Mr. Edward Ellice, maintained that the value of the Currency was raised at least 30 per cent.; and Mr. Alexander Baring, a man of more experience in commercial affairs and funded operations, than any man in Europe, and besides, a person of rare sagacity in all money matters—expressed his belief that the appreciation amounted to from 25 to 30 per cent. We have been always ourselves inclined to think that it was above 40; and we believe the present First Lord of the Admiralty was of opinion that it was considerably above 30. What an alteration did this bill alone cause in the nature of contracts! “Already (said Sir James Graham, in 1827) has Mr. Peel's bill occasioned an immense transfer of property; it has conferred on the fundholder a benefit to the extent of the depreciation of the money which he advanced; in many cases this is equal to 35 per cent. But this rise of the fundlords is effected at the ruin of the landlord. Estates which have been held from generation to generation in the same family, are rapidly changing owners, and as the country gentleman

retires the fundholder advances. The Government may view the change with indifference; the Treasury may continue to receive its taxes; but it is hard that the landed gentry should be driven from their hereditary possessions for the sake of a bonus to the fundholder, to which he is by no means entitled. Both the nobility and gentry must fall from their high estate under the operation of this act: their reduced rental must be absorbed in the necessary outgoings and fixed charges on their property, and nothing will be left to sustain the dignity of their rank and station."

It certainly would be difficult to show why the fundlord should not be taxed for the support of the Poor and for the County Rate, as well as the landlord. At the time of the passing of the 43d of Elizabeth, all property was taxed for the support of the aged and infirm, and for setting the able-bodied to labour. Mines, underwoods, water-courses, &c., were each subject to this just and charitable burden. It is true that the Funds did not then exist, but had they existed, can any one doubt that the original framers of the Poor Laws had not made them as subservient to the purposes of this great state measure as every other species of property?

There can be no doubt that pauperism is greatly increased by heavy taxation. At the commencement of the reign of Geo. III., the poor-rates amounted only to 600,000*l.* per annum. Now they amount to nearly 8,000,000*l.* yearly, in a restored or appreciated currency. The fatal effects of tampering with the currency either by its contraction or extension, not only on private but on public debts, fully appears on looking to the History of France. When under Louis XIV., the currency had been depreciated 27 per cent., universal distress was the consequence. All pecuniary contracts which had been previously made were raised one third against the debtor. The result was that there was scarcely a proprietor who did not see his patrimony melt away without possessing the slightest means of prevention.\* No man more clearly showed the effect of this tampering in England, than Sir James Graham. "I will suppose," says the hon. baronet, "a case of the head of a family dying in 1813, and leaving a rental of 5000*l.* a-year to his eldest son, with a jointure to his widow of 1000*l.* a-year, and a rent charge in the shape of annuities to younger children, to the extent of 1500*l.* a-year more. The father had made his will in 1792, and under that will had assigned to his widow 500*l.* a-year, and to his younger children an annuity of 750*l.*; but the rental of the property was then only 3000*l.* per annum; with the depreciation of the war the rental rose, before 1813, to 5000*l.* a-year; and the proprietor revoking his former will in the year of his death, doubled his wife's jointure and the annuities of his younger children. The mint price of gold that year was 5*l.* 10*s.* per ounce, and consequently the depreciation of paper 41 per cent. Nothing could be more fair than this increase to the family burdens at the time when it was made, and according to the rate of the then existing prices; but the change has proved ruinous to the heir; the Legislature itself has defrauded him; the depreciation by which his father was deceived in 1813, is now not only avowed but remedied by act of Parliament. *The annuitants on his estate enjoy their double incomes and pay their half prices; he receives his half rental and pays the double annuity.*"

---

\* Vide Fourbonnaia "Considerations sur les Finances de France."

Sir James Graham did not hesitate to point out the remedy for this state of things with his usual directness, and to this remedy we must come at last. The hon member then dared to propose a direct tax on the annuitant. It was then, as it is now, contended that such a measure would destroy national credit, and prevent us from ever borrowing again; but this opinion is decidedly at variance with fact and reason. David Hume suggested this course considerably more than half a century ago. He says that "under such circumstances of heavy debt the revenue must be raised from a continued taxation of the annuitant, or what is the same thing, from mortgaging anew a certain part of their annuities, and thus making them contribute to their own defence and that of the nation;"\* and did we need an example among modern nations we might recur to Austria and Russia. Austria depreciated her currency 400 per cent.†; acknowledged the depreciation, by law, compelled her paper to pass 400 per cent. below its nominal value, and still to this hour she has no difficulty in borrowing even in England. And the same may be predicated of Russia, whose silver rouble is three times the value of her paper one.

During the session in which his pamphlet was published, Sir James Graham spoke on the corn laws. The advocates for a free trade in corn were for abolishing all protection and restrictions. On this occasion Sir James's proposals were perfectly fair. "If," said he, "we are to have a free trade in corn, let us have also a free trade in money, and destroy that fatal connexion between the Government and a single chartered bank, which facilitates the prodigality of the ministers and invests an irresponsible body with the most delicate and important functions of state, the controul over the circulating medium. Nor will it be wise to stop only at this point; if the landowner is to give up his monopoly for the public good, shall the East India Company and the West India Proprietors be suffered for one day to retain the exclusive enjoyment of their exclusive privileges? Shall the consumer be forced to pay an exorbitant price for his tea and for his sugar, that particular interests may be benefited; and shall the nobility and gentry of these realms, the owners of the native soil *alone* be sacrificed? On the contrary let us adopt the sound principles of free trade; but let us not limit their application to the staple produce of our land. Let us destroy the heavy duties on timber, which at the expense of every man building a ship or a house in the mother country, are at best a paltry premium to our colonies; and since we are bent on establishing an open competition with the foreign manufacturer; let us at once reduce largely those taxes which affect both the commerce and manufactures of our country."

This is certainly sound reason. Trade to be free at all, should be universally, not partially so; and therefore we are, and always have been an advocate for a free trade in all things, and a provision for the revenue from the general wealth, and not from any particular class of property in the country. In this spirit we should be as warm an advocate as Sir James Graham himself, for removing all those burthens that press upon the land, either as preliminary to, or contemporaneously

---

\* Hume's "Essay on Public Credit," p. 379.

† Vide "Malchies sur l'Administration des Finances." See also a small Tract attributed to Gentz on this subject, and wherein the difference between the "*Wiener Währung*," and "*Conventions Muntz*," is described.

with the approximation to a free trade in corn : and that these burthens are neither few nor light, we will show from an actual example taken from a farmer of 130 acres, in the county of Essex, who is obliged to pay 60*l.* annually for poor, highway, and church rates ; and from 37*l.* to 40*l.* annually, for tithes. Let us however recur to the counties of Somersetshire and Surrey, and it will be found that the outgoings are nearly as great in the one and greater in the other. On a farm of 250 acres in the former county, the church and poor rates amounted to 33*l.* 16*s.* 6*d.* ; the vicarial tithe to 9*l.* 7*s.* ; the high and bye-way rate to 5*l.* 12*s.* 9*d.* ; the assessed taxes to 7*l.* 12*s.* ; thus making a total of 56*l.* 8*s.* 3*d.* On a farm of 250 acres, in Surrey, the tithe would amount to 75*l.* ; the highway statute duty to 18*l.* ; the highway-rate to 6*l.* 5*s.* ; the church rate to 3*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* ; the poor-rate to 75*l.* ; and the assessed taxes to 5*l.*, making a total of 182*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

It is not therefore wonderful that a large landowner, like Sir James Graham, should have strenuously opposed a free trade in corn till the landlord had the advantage of a free trade in every thing else, and became disburthened of the exclusive imposts falling on the land in England. It was not alone for this he contended in 1827 ; he called on Ministers to reduce the expenditure, and insisted that as they had raised pensions and salaries to meet the debasement in the currency in 1797, they ought correspondingly to reduce them on the restoration of a metallic standard in 1819. He was, therefore, opposed to the increase of the salaries of the judges, and hinted that the pay of the soldiers, amounting now to 13*d.* a-day, was only 6*d.* in 1792. He did not spare those servants of the crown, approvers of Sir Robert Peel's bill—all of whom profited at the expense of the community by this portentous change ; for it was clear that every such rise in the value of money was as well an advance on all pay derived from the revenue as on all taxes borne by the people. He contended that it was strange when reliance was placed on historical example, under circumstances totally dissimilar, that the course pursued by other countries, in a state of affairs identically the same, should not have been entirely overlooked ; for in France, after the abolition of *assignats* and *mandats*, and the re-establishment of a metallic currency, the government ascertained the value of the *louis d'or*, as compared with *assignats* at different periods ; and in this simple manner, on reference to the given price of the *louis d'or* at any given time, contracts were reduced to their real value ; and more recently, when the French Government altered the value of its money to the extent of 5 per cent., it provided by law for a corresponding adjustment of all debts. The United States of America also, when in the last extremity of their struggle for independence, they resorted to a depreciation of their currency, guarded against the fatal effects of their own measure, by enacting, that no bargain or contract for land should be valid if on a credit of longer term than three days.

The speech, however, which gained Sir James Graham the greatest credit, and which raised him to the very highest rank in his party, was that on the Civil List, delivered in 1829. On this question of economical reform, he proved that 113 Privy Councillors received a sum, equal, according to Mr. Cobbett's calculation, to the support of 384,000 Englishmen. Henceforth the hon. member for Carlisle spoke more

frequently, and he was listened to with the profoundest attention. During the first part of the year, 1830 he almost invariably divided with Mr. Hume, and originated three or four motions, which shook the government of the Duke of Wellington to its very centre. At length the success of the motion of Sir Henry Parnell had the effect of driving the Duke of Wellington from office. The reins of power were confided to our present Premier. It was, we believe at first, intended to make Sir James Chancellor of the Exchequer, and there can be no doubt that the Right Hon. Baronet would have filled this high office with zeal and efficiency, but some of his doctrines touching the currency were not palatable to the monied interests, and the project was abandoned. The nation may, sooner or later, have cause to regret this; for, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir James would have been in his element, whereas he has no taste or predilection for the Admiralty. Not that we mean to insinuate that he is incompetent to the performance of his duty, or that he does not perform it well, for we believe Sir James to be highly competent, and we have heard that the service is greatly content with the manner in which he dispenses patronage—but since he has gone to the Admiralty he rarely favours the House with his sentiments unless in his own peculiar branch of the public service, and this is somewhat prejudicial to a Cabinet, whose leader in the House of Commons is not over gifted with the *torrens dicendi*, and whose manner is about as undignified as can be well conceived. It is a pity that Lord Althorp was not transferred to the Admiralty, where his father, as Lord Spencer, acquired a just renown,—and that Sir James was not installed into the Exchequer, where he might do the state some “substantial service,” by bolder and wiser financial measures.

On Friday, the 13th ultimo, the Ministers confided to the First Lord of the Admiralty a Bill for the regulation of the Exchequer. This was well, and he performed the duty in a manner equal to their expectations. Let them go a step further, and offer to Sir James the Chancellorship, and they will serve alike the Cabinet and the country. On two recent occasions Sir James's parliamentary efforts are in the memory of our readers: the first on the Corn Laws, in opposition to Mr. Hume's motion, when he stood forward as the champion of the landed interest. The opinions advocated by Sir James on this occasion were natural to a considerable landholder, and he may be well content to hold them with two of the greatest modern reformers, Cromwell and Napoleon. No man was more sensible of the value of an agricultural population than the Brewer of Huntingdon; and Napoleon, in his conversations with Las Casas, spoke of agriculture as the soul and first basis of an empire. Talking to Lord Ebrington at Elba, he said, “Agriculture has always been my first object, then manufactures, thirdly, commerce.”\* Let the opinions of our readers be what they may on this subject, it must be confessed that Sir James did his utmost for the landed interest.

Of his opposition to the motion on the Impressment of Seamen, it would be difficult for us to speak, without risking the imputation of partiality. We shall merely say, therefore, what we sincerely believe,

---

\* Vide Ebrington's Conversations with Napoleon, p. 24.

that the opposition of the Ministry to this motion, both in the last session and in the present, arose more from an unwillingness to allow any member of the liberal party, and especially a representative of one of the newly-created constituencies, as well as a new member of the House, to take the lead in so important a question—than from any real aversion to the proposition itself: and Sir James Graham being, from his official station, the most appropriate person to be put forward to oppose it—did it with the best grace he could;—always admitting that the objects sought by the honourable mover were highly commendable; but pretending that they could all be accomplished by the Registration Bill, to which, it is evident, the strong expression of public opinion both within and without the House against Impressment had driven him. By these means he obtained a great number of votes from persons who were really opposed to Impressment, but who thought that whatever was to be done had better be left in the hands of the Government than in those of persons not appointed by, or generally voting with the Administration.

It remains for us now but to say a few words on the personal appearance, the oratorical manner, and the general merits as a debater of the subject of this Sketch. Sir James Graham is tall in stature, with a gentlemanly, frank, and prepossessing air. His exterior is eminently agreeable and manly—Nature has given him a clear and distinct voice, and a ready flowing and easy speech—and he enhances these gifts by the aid of art. Though not so much a man of fashion as the Foreign Secretary, it is nevertheless apparent that he holds the skill and science of dress in high repute. There is no appearance of dandyism in his air, but it is plain enough that he wishes to be taken for what he certainly is—a really well-bred and well-dressed country gentleman. When in Opposition, he was by no means so stout as he has since become; and his present *embonpoint* has nearly destroyed the keen and intellectual look by which he was formerly distinguished. There is now an appearance of obesity about him, which it would require half-a-dozen years of opposition to sweat away; but on the whole he is the best dressed man in the Cabinet, except Lord Palmerston, and the best looking, except Lord Melbourne; and, perhaps, there may be found many who will even say that he is better dressed than the one and handsomer than the other. It is, therefore, no marvel, that a naturally good-natured and urbane man, possessed of so many extrinsic advantages, should be able to secure a ready and willing audience in the House of Commons; more especially as his style of speaking is remarkably calculated to please. It is easy, fluent, and gentlemanlike. It appears wholly without effort, though it is plain enough to see it is the combined result of study, practice, and great reflection. Though of a classic and elegant mind, and of more than ordinary knowledge, it must, nevertheless, be averred that Sir James Graham has never vindicated his claim to the repute of being a good debater. As a holiday or set speaker, with the advantage of adequate preparation, he approaches very near to perfection; but he has not yet proved that he could rise in the instant with the ready instinct of a Brougham or a Canning, to cover the retreat of an injudicious friend, or to carry war into the heart of the camp of an enemy. But though not gifted with those powers of debate, which Mr. Stanley and Sir

Robert Peel wield with such consummate art and dexterity—and sometimes let it be said with so little mercy—he is certainly as well-informed a man, clearly a much more frank and popular man, and in our opinion would make a much better Prime Minister than either. In a word, Sir James Graham is an accomplished, shrewd, sensible, well-informed English gentleman, endowed with strong British feelings, anxious for the honour and prosperity of his country, and willing to make great sacrifices for the promotion and perpetuation of the national weal.

#### GUILT OF THOSE WHO REFUSE TO MAKE ANY SACRIFICE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THEIR COUNTRY.

WHAT must be the guilt of those men, who can calmly contemplate the approach of anarchy or despotism, and rather choose to behold the ruin of their country, than resign the smallest pittance of private emolument and advantage! To reconcile the disaffected, to remove discontents, to allay animosities, and open a prospect of increasing happiness and freedom, is yet in our power. But if a contrary course be taken, the sun of Great Britain is set for ever, her glory departed, and her history added to the catalogue of the mighty empires which exhibit the instability of all human grandeur, of empires, which, after they rose by virtue to be the admiration of the world, sunk by corruption into obscurity and contempt. If any thing shall then remain of her boasted constitution, it will display magnificence in disorder, majestic desolation, Babylon in ruins, where in the midst of broken arches and fallen columns, posterity will trace the *monuments* only of our ancient freedom!—*Robert Hall.*

#### EXCESSIVE-POPULATION FALLACY.

That 'wages depend upon the relation between capital and population' is the proposition upon which this fallacious theory is built. The proposition itself is true, but it forms only a part, not the whole of the case. Increase the capital, population remaining the same, or increase the capital faster than the population, and wages will rise. In like manner, if you were to reduce the population without reducing the capital, wages would rise. In either of these cases, as there would be more capital in proportion to labourers, each labourer would have more, or his wages would rise. But this is not the real point at issue:—the question is, if you reduce the labouring population, will the capital also be reduced? and the answer must be in the affirmative; and not only will the capital be reduced, but it will be reduced in a greater degree than the population! This, however, is a point into which the anti-populationists have not enquired; they have *assumed* that capital would be undiminished,—that it would remain the same in amount after the population had been reduced [that] it was before, and in this *false assumption* lies the foundation of the whole of their erroneous theory. They seem not to be aware that the labour is necessary to the creation of the capital, and this strange oversight has led to all the absurdities that have been advanced respecting the excessive population of Great Britain, and the means of improving the condition of the people by reducing their numbers.—*Hopkins's Great Britain for the last Forty Years.*

---

## SUPERIORITY OF THE SYSTEM OF MANNING THE NAVY IN FRANCE TO IMPRESSMENT.

---

IN reference to the motion lately discussed in the British House of Commons on the Impressment of Seamen a (subject that still excites the deepest interest in the sea ports of England), we think the following account of the mode of manning in the navy in France, will be acceptable to many of our readers, and follow most appropriately our biographical and characteristic Sketch of the First Lord of the Admiralty. It is derived from several sources, to the authenticity of all of which we pledge ourselves. A portion of our information was obtained from official documents, to which access was had, under the administration of the Count Villele, and the remainder has been furnished to us by an ex-minister of marine, under Charles the Tenth. It may not be unnecessary to observe here, that every thing relating to the Navy in France is under the controul of the minister of marine and colonies. He has also the direction and superintendence of the galley slaves at the sea-ports; his salary is 120,000 francs a-year.

The system of manning the navy, established by the National Convention, still exists in France. Its leading provisions are as follows:—A special register is kept, in which the name of every French citizen is inserted, who is destined for the naval profession. Persons engaging in the sea service, either on board a ship of war, a merchantman, or even a fishing-smack, are liable to the same conditions as to the station they assume at their entrance. From ten to fifteen years of age, they must be content to serve in the capacity of "*mousse*," which is analogous to our cabin-boy—above fifteen their station is a step higher, with the title of "*novice*"—Any "*novice*" or "*mousse*" who has made a voyage of six months in either of these capacities, and has satisfactorily passed the required examinations, may be employed as "*aspirant*," or candidate for promotion. Every person having completed his eighteenth year, who has made two long voyages, who has been eighteen months at sea, who has been employed two years in the fisheries, or who has served two years as an apprentice on board any ship, is liable to the naval conscription. To this effect he is required to present himself, with his father, if living, and two of his near relations or neighbours, at the Bureau of Inscriptions, in his parish, where his name must be registered. There he is to be instructed in the laws and regulations which point out the rights and duties of all registered seamen. Those who have attained the age, and have fulfilled any one of the conditions before mentioned, and who continue in the sea-service as fishermen, merchant-seamen, or otherwise, although they have not inscribed their names at the office for that purpose, are nevertheless included in the naval conscription, they being considered as having tacitly given their consent, by remaining in the sea-service. Those included in the naval conscription are exempt from every other



public duty, except that of the Government naval service, employment in marine arsenals, or as national guards in the quarter in which they reside. The names of all volunteer seamen are inscribed in a special register, and they are employed in preference to the conscripts. Every volunteer seaman, and even "*novice*," who has already made a voyage, and who desires to enter on board a ship of war, has a right to a bounty equal to one month's full pay. If the number of sailors rejected as volunteers, exceeds the contingent to be furnished by the parish to which they belong, those who stand first on the list are first employed. If the number of volunteers falls short of the contingent required, the deficiency is supplied by a draft from the register.

Every maritime district is divided into quarters, and in every quarter the sailors are distributed into 4 classes;—The first class comprehends all the unmarried men; the second, widowers without children; the third, married men without children; and the fourth is composed of married men with children. The second class are not called on to serve until all in the first class are employed, and their numbers found insufficient.—The same rule applies to the third and fourth classes.—In every quarter, the sailor who has served the shortest period on board a ship-of-war, is first called upon; and where there is an equality of service, a preference is given to those who have first entered the service; they however, have no claim whatever to the bounty granted to volunteers. Every seaman who has attained his 50th year, is exempted from serving on board a King's ship, or in the public arsenals, without losing the right to serve on board a trading vessel, or following the fishing-trade. Every seaman of whatever age, who chooses to quit the fishing-trade or merchant-service, may have his name erased from the naval register, one year after his having made a declaration to that effect, except in time of war, or when war shall have broken out before the year has expired. A seaman is at liberty to enter on board a merchant ship, a fishing-boat, or he may remove into any port of France, by giving notice, and being inscribed in the muster-roll of seamen, in the quarter he leaves, or in that to which he removes. By a law passed on the 7th of April, 1832, the seamen regularly entered on board a ship employed in the whale-fishery, are exempted from the naval conscription.

The promotion of seamen depends on the length of service on board vessels belonging to the State, meritorious acts, &c. All registered seamen are bound to serve the State when called upon and balloted for—all seamen (officers and sailors) are allowed pensions according to their rank, age, wounds, or infirmities. These pensions are of two kinds: the one consists of half the amount of their full pay, after 25 years' actual service, either on board a king's ship, merchant vessel, or in an arsenal; the other is an allowance called *solde de retraite*, and is granted after 25 years' service, in the Royal Navy, six of which must have been at sea.—But in case of wounds, or the loss of an eye, or limb, a fixed pension is granted, according to rank, without taking into consideration the period of service. The widows and children of seamen are entitled to an allowance upon the same scale as that granted to the widows and children of soldiers.

The system of recruiting the Navy having been found extremely defective, it was deemed necessary to adopt a more regular and permanent

organization of its several branches.—To effect this important amelioration, a royal ordonnance was promulgated in 1823, for establishing a distinct body of seamen to serve on ship-board, or in the naval arsenals, to be called *Equipage de Ligne*,\* and to supersede the body formerly known as the *Fantassins de Marine*, and at various periods under various names, such as *Les Bataillons de Marine*, *les Equipages de hautbord*, and finally, by a recent ordonnance *des Compagnies permanentes de la Marine*. The body is divided into separate corps: each corps is composed of a permanent staff of 10 persons, and of four companies of 150 men each.

All the officers of the Royal Navy, from the rank of *Ensigne de Vaisseau* to that of *Capitaine de Frégate* inclusive, must be employed in the *Equipage de Ligne*, and serve in it 2 years successively, unless they receive orders to the contrary, from the Minister of Marine.—But on no account can the changes in the Staff of the *Equipages de Ligne* affect more than one-half the number of officers of each corps. Every seaman belonging to the *Equipages de Ligne* must be instructed and rendered fit to perform all duties whatever which relate to the manœuvring, piloting, serving at the guns, or repairing of a vessel, together with the manual exercise as a marine on ship-board, or in the naval arsenal. The men of the *Equipages de Ligne* are employed in all vessels from a ship of the line to a sixteen-gun brig, inclusive. When a corps of this class is embarked on board different vessels, the detachments must never be less than half a company, and the number of officers and seamen required to complete the crews of those vessels, must be furnished by the port in which they lie, from the ordinary maritime conscripts. Vessels under the rate of sixteen guns are manned by conscript seamen only.

The recruiting of the *Equipages de Ligne* is effected either from the usual conscriptions, or from voluntary enrolments. The non-commissioned officers and privates belonging to the *Troupes de la Marine*, or marine corps of artillery, may be transferred into the *Equipages de Ligne*, provided they obtain the authority of the minister.

The officers and privates admitted into this class, must be at least five feet five inches high, English measure; and a *mousse*, or cabin boy, four feet ten and a half inches. The period of the engagement of a volunteer is eight years—volunteers, who neither belong to the maritime conscription nor to any other organized corps, must be of the age of twenty-one years and a half complete. Mariners, belonging to the conscription, are not admitted into the *Equipages de Ligne* after they are thirty years old, or naval officers after forty-five, except by the special authority of the minister. Youths, under eighteen years old,

---

\* La creation des Equipages de Ligne (says an Ex-Minister of Marine, in a letter to the writer) est une des plus importantes ameliorations apportées au systeme maritime de la France. C'est à lui que l'on est redevable de la rapidité de l'armement qui avait pour objet l'expédition d'Alger et du peu de gêne qui en est résulté pour le commerce, auquel on n'a emprunté que 2000 matelots.

The creation of this class, the Equipages de Ligne, is one of the most important improvements that has been introduced into the Maritime system of France. It is to this chiefly, that is to be attributed the promptness and rapidity with which the expedition was fitted out, that was destined for Algiers, and also, the very slight inconvenience that this equipment caused to the commercial marine, of which the naval armament had only occasion to borrow 2000 seamen in all.

who wish to enrol themselves in the *Equipages de Ligne*, must present themselves before their prefect or sous-prefect, provided with a certificate of their birth, the consent of their father or guardian; or if they have no guardian, of their nearest relatives, together with a certificate of good character, by the mayor of their communes. Youths cannot enter into a regular engagement before they have attained their eighteenth year. In every sea-port, the resort of ships of war, a general depot is established of the *Equipages de Ligne*, to which all who are destined to serve in them are sent. This depot is under the command of a post-captain in the royal navy, *Capitaine de Vaisseau*. On arriving at the depot, the men are formed into provisional companies as follows:

1 Lieutenant.—1 Ensign.—2 Midshipmen.—2 Second Masters of Manœuvre and Gunners.—2 Master's Mates of ditto.—16 Seamen of all classes.—100 Apprentices.—2 Fifers and 2 Drummers (*as mousses*.)

The officers and masters are chosen from among those who are the most capable of teaching the recruits their manœuvres, and the use of large and small arms.

To each company, four schoolmasters are attached; one for the elementary mathematics, as applied to navigation, for the use of young officers; a second for reading, writing, and arithmetic, on the Madras system, or as it is called in France, the system of mutual instruction; the third, a fencing-master; and the fourth, a teacher of swimming.

All payments made on account of the service of the navy, are subject to a deduction of 3 per cent. for the support of the sick, and for granting pensions to naval invalids. There never has existed any special asylum similar to Greenwich Hospital.

There are several Marine Schools in France, one called the Marine College, at Angoulême, founded in 1816. The Minister of Marine has the superintendence of this establishment, and 150 scholars are admitted gratuitously. The expense is 62,000 francs per annum. There is at Brest a school, called *Ecole Spéciale du Génie Maritime*. There are also gratuitous marine schools in almost every port of France.\*

We need not ask the reader which mode of manning the navy is best—that of France, with its organized system of previous training, education, routine of service, and ample pensions for the men, or that of England by Impressment, with all its cruelties and horrors. But we rejoice to find the universal conviction of the people of England to be, that Impressment has received its death-blow, and will never be resorted to again. We believe so too, and hope before another session passes to hear its death-warrant read in a speech from the throne.

\* Outre les Ecoles mentionnés (says an Ex-minister of Marine), il en existe cinq destinées aux fils de matelots. Ces écoles sont établis abord de bâtiments flottants. Les élèves y reçoivent une instruction qui les rend aptes à devenir maîtres d'équipages. Chaque école entretient 500 élèves de l'âge de 8 à 14 ans.

Besides the schools named, there are five which are destined for the sons of seamen. These schools are established on board ships afloat. The boys there receive an instruction which is calculated to qualify them for masters of ships. Each school instructs 500 boys, from 8 to 14 years of age.

## SUPERIORITY OF A PROPERTY AND INCOME TAX TO EVERY OTHER SOURCE OF REVENUE.

THE space afforded us by the Recess, enables us to fulfil a pledge frequently made, of recurring again to the question of a Property and Income Tax, which we treated of in the First Series of the Parliamentary Review, previous to a motion on that subject being submitted to the House of Commons. The question is now about to be again discussed, on the motion of Mr. Robinson, after Easter; and as we think there is scarcely any question less understood, or one on which so much misconception and prejudice prevails, we shall make no apology for reverting to our former statements, and drawing largely from our former arguments as the ground-work of this article, strengthening it, however, by facts and arguments drawn from more recent events, and placing a new Graduated Scale before our readers, constructed on principles of such fairness and equity, that we think none but those who desire unjust exemption from their fair share of the public burthens, will object to it.

Our first object will be to shew the *justice* of a Property or Income Tax—next its *practicability*—then its *economy*—and lastly its *productiveness*;—and if it exceeds all other modes of Taxation in these particulars, its claims to speedy adoption will be complete. We are aware of the odium which the very name of an Income Tax carries with it to some ears; but this will not deter us from pursuing our advocacy of it. No great change was ever yet produced in matters of legislation or finance, that did not draw down on its earliest advocates the censure of their being rash innovators, theoretical projectors, &c. We are prepared for all this; and beg the reader merely to wait till he has examined our arguments, and then he will be at liberty to refute them, if he can, or to bestow on us what epithet he pleases.

We begin with an enumeration of the principal elements of a just scheme of Taxation, not enumerating all, but taking only the most striking and important, which appear to us to be these.

1. That the smallest possible amount of tax, consistent with the safety of the state, should be taken from the people:—Because capital is creative, and wealth becomes the source of wealth; therefore, while the sums abstracted in taxes cease to be productive in their expenditure, whatever is suffered to remain in the possession of the people, augments and reproduces, by judicious use, in every succeeding operation of agriculture, commerce, or manufacture.

2. That the nature of the tax should be so simple and intelligible as that the most uninformed person who is subject to its operation could easily comprehend it, clearly understand its bearings, and give to it the full measure of his approbation or dissent:—Because cheerful acquiescence can only be given to that which is clearly understood; and

because dissatisfaction arising from ignorance is the most dangerous of all discontents, and the most difficult to allay.

3. That the tax should be as certain and economical as possible in its collection:—Because all charges incurred in this operation are absolute waste, being equally lost to the payer and receiver, or to the people and the government,—thus serving only to support a body of useless and unproductive beings, who could be much better employed.

4. That the tax should be as much as possible of a nature not to be secretly evaded;—Because the demoralization which frauds upon the revenue occasion, is of itself a serious evil; and because the practice of enjoying advantages, and not contributing the proper share of sacrifice with others with whom such advantages are participated, is selfish, dishonourable, and revolting to every just and patriotic mind.

5. That the tax should be as favourable as possible to consumption:—Because the only wealth possessed by the great bulk of the community is their labour; and as, whatever impedes consumption throws that labour out of demand, and whatever increases consumption makes that labour more in request: so, the great majority of the people are in prosperity or in misery, in proportion to the relation which consumption bears to their power of supplying materials for it exercise.

6. That the tax should bear as strict a relation as possible to the means of the individuals who have to pay it:—Because by this alone can each man's interest in the state be at the same time fairly burthened and fairly protected.

It would be easy to show that every one of these principles is violated by the existing mode of taxation in all countries of the world; and though different states exhibit these errors in very different degrees, yet there is not one nation on the earth in which they do not abound in their financial laws. In the present inquiry, however, reference will be made to England only. For example:—

1. Every undeserved pension, and every superfluous appointment (and unhappily there are still many of each of these evils left untouched) is a violation of the first principle,—that taxes should never exceed the smallest amount necessary to maintain the institutions, protect the property, and preserve the peace and safety of the state:—Because these excrescences are *not* necessary; and the property of the whole is *not* protected, but invaded thereby; while every shilling of tax so appropriated is a waste of money for unproductive purposes, which, had it remained in the possession of the people, would have been capable of continual improvement. "

2. The existing taxes, instead of being simple and intelligible, are so confused and complicated, that the most skilful financier in the kingdom does not know the names or amount of all, nor the bearings or effects of one half that are raised. Hence the conflicting statements of different Chancellors of the Exchequer;—hence the opposite pictures of prosperity and adversity drawn from the very same tables and returns;—hence finance committees, who are years unravelling the mysterious web;—and hence the ignorance, so general and so profound, that the first merchants, manufacturers, and agriculturists, differ in their opinions on the multifarious questions that these multitudinous taxes generate; while the most fatal errors are committed,

in contracts, purchases, and sales, from the impossibility of any single individual having a complete, comprehensive, and accurate knowledge of all the taxes that at any time exist, their fluctuations, their bearings, and their immediate or contingent effects.

3. The taxes are now so difficult of collection, that an immense expense is incurred, in the establishment of custom-houses in every port, excise-offices in every town, coast-blockades, a revenue service by sea and land, and hosts of collectors, informers, and spies; with all of which the business is but still imperfectly performed; as, in addition to the evil which this expense creates, a still greater loss is incurred by many of the taxed articles not being brought under the operation of the tax at all, from the facility which this very cumbrousness of the machinery affords to the dishonest for escaping from its operation.

4. The taxes are now the most powerful impediments to consumption that human ingenuity could invent. To say nothing of the raw produce which is consumed in the state in which it is either imported or grown,—as tea, sugar, coffee, and a variety of other articles, the consumption of which is not one-fourth of what it would be, if all were exempt from duties; and by the restrictions on which, all labour employed in their growth, preparation, or conveyance, is less in amount, and less in value, than if the consumption were greater;—to say nothing of the evils inflicted by the present system of taxation on all this imported produce, which, by impeding its consumption in England, equally impedes the sale of English goods, which would form the payments for the foreign supplies;—if we turn to those articles which derive their chief value from being wrought into manufactures by the labour of the community, we shall see that there is scarcely one that is not burthened with a tax that impedes its consumption. Among others, cotton, silk, hemp, flax, wool, timber, metals, glass, tallow, oil, leather, rags, paper, and a never-ending catalogue of *materials*, the working up of which furnishes the great mass of the people with labour and subsistence: all these are so taxed, that not half the quantity of either is now consumed which would undoubtedly find purchasers if all were entirely free of impost; and consequently, by these restraints, labour is thrown out of demand, and all classes are sufferers thereby.

5. The taxes levied at present bear no just relation to the means of the individuals called upon to pay them; all those which are considered most productive, bearing heavier on the poor than on the rich, in proportion to their respective means of payment. Among others, the taxes that affect the price of bread, beer, dwellings, light, soap, candles, and apparel, are all grievous in the extreme to the poor, because a certain portion of each of these is indispensable to bare subsistence, and to the performance of their daily labour; while the rich, by not consuming in any case a *hundred* times as much of each of these as the poor—individual compared with individual—though their means are often a *thousand fold* greater, do not sustain their just share of the burthens which fall thus heaviest on those who are least able to bear them. Again: the taxes on justice and knowledge, the duty on paper for correspondence or for printed books, the taxes on friendly communication, by the profits made on the conveyance of letters, the

taxes on goods sold by auction, however great the distress that occasions it, and a great number of others, affect the poor deeply, without affecting the rich in any thing like the same degree: and while the landholder, great and small, is burthened with all manner of incumbrances, in taxes, tithes, poor-rates, &c.—he, again burthening the farmer by correspondingly high rents, and all other classes by the restrictive corn-laws, as an equivalent,—the fundholder, however rich, is exempt from burthens of a corresponding nature on the property from which his income is derived.

If there be added to all this, the taxes on legal proceedings, which offer a direct bounty to iniquity, by giving the rich the power to impede justice to the poor: the taxes on bills of exchange, receipts, agreements, contracts, &c., which are a temptation to evasion, as well as a clog to necessary transactions of business; the taxes on insurance, which are punishments for prudence, and a bounty to carelessness and indifference: the taxes on newspapers and advertisements, which are hinderances to knowledge, and to the necessary facilities to inventions, and novelties in trade; not to mention a host of others equally objectionable, it may be safely said that the most ingenious man living could hardly hope to invent any system so thoroughly and entirely clumsy, barbarous, unequal, and defeating all its avowed ends, as the system of taxation under which we have now lived in England for so many centuries, and from which, unless there is a *complete change* in the entire plan, no taking off the taxes from one commodity to place them on another, will do more than afford a very partial and temporary relief.

The substitution of one single source of revenue in a direct tax on property and income, would obviate all these difficulties. It would not be subject to a single one of all the objections enumerated; but would, on the contrary, be conformable to each of the Principles of Taxation, laid down as the basis on which all supplies raised for the service of the state should be regulated: so that if these principles be admitted to be just, the system which best realizes them may be fairly considered to be most worthy of adoption.

The data upon which any *exact* estimate can be made of the probable result of a Graduated Income or Property Tax, can only be collected by the Government. But as we *know* that at the present moment a revenue of 70,000,000*l.* and upwards, is actually raised from the pockets of the people of England, including the tithes and contributions to the church, the county and poor-rates, and a variety of other branches of local taxation over and above the revenue paid for the general purposes of the State, it must be evident that as large a sum of money can be raised from the same mass of people, by taxing their income or property, as by taxing the commodities they consume—since it is in both cases the people who pay it. At present the taxes paid are on the amount of people's *expenditure*. We would merely change it to a tax on people's *income*, from whatever source derived: and if the general income of the country be only equal to its general expenditure, the amount capable of being raised must in each case be the same; though in reality, as all countries making progress in wealth must have an *excess* of income over expenditure, the tax on income, if correctly levied, would produce more than the tax on expenditure levied at the same rate.

The amount of the population to be made subject to the operation of such an Income or Property Tax, should include only those who can contribute to the support of the State, without depriving themselves of any of the necessities of life; and should therefore be kept within certain limits of income, as a *minimum*, below which no contributions should be raised. Now, the population of the British Isles, according to the latest census, may be taken in round numbers at 25 millions. Taking one fourth of these to represent the adult males—one fourth the adult females—and the other half to include children, which is about the proportion in which these several classes stand to each other, there would then be at least 6 millions of men, from whose property or whose incomes (leaving the women and children untouched) a revenue might be raised. Striking off, however, the full half of this number, namely, 3 millions, as being in a condition of too great poverty to be taxed at all, (though, according to the present system, the very poorest, and weakest, and youngest, of both sexes, are all included in the grasp of those taxes which are placed on the necessities of life,) we should have a number of 3 millions of men, as adults and heads of families, or one eighth of the whole population, from which to raise the revenue required.

We would propose, then, to begin the scale of taxable income at 100*l.* per annum, considering that less than this amount of annual income ought not to be trenched upon, if we desire to see comfort reign among the humblest classes, and means afforded to every parent to bring up his family in habits of order, propriety, and religion; and to give to all his children that necessary degree of education to fit them for the due performance of their duties as citizens, and to procure an honest livelihood, by the exercise of their mental and bodily faculties combined.

Commencing at this point, we would proceed upward, by a graduated scale, increasing by slight additions to the rate of tax, till it reached incomes of 10,000*l.* per annum—where the *maximum* of the rate might end; and all incomes above that amount be taxed at the same per centage throughout.

We would make a clear distinction, however, between incomes derived from professions, trades, or other precarious and fluctuating sources of gain, incomes lasting only for life, as annuities, pensions, &c., and incomes derived from fixed property, such as lands, houses, funds, descending in perpetuity to successors, &c.—taxing them at different rates, in consideration of the impermanency of the one and the durability of the other, and preserving that proportion throughout.

It has been contended by some, that incomes arising from professions or trades ought not to be taxed at all, inasmuch as such a tax would withdraw money from productive and accumulating use, and thereby cripple commerce and trade. But this argument, if it be worth anything at all, would be equally valid against taxing incomes arising from fixed property in land or funds; as, whatever is abstracted from the income of the rich landholder or the poor shopkeeper, and absorbed by the Government to pay its expences, is equally withdrawn from the productive expenditure and circulation of the country. It is a good argument against raising one farthing more of revenue than is absolutely indispensable; but it is no better argument against the



justice of a tax on one description of income than it would be against any other. To exempt incomes arising from professions and trades, from all tax whatever, and to make incomes arising from realized property subject to tax, would, in our opinion, be the height of impolicy, as well as injustice, and could not be defended by any argument based on reason or common sense. Let us put a case. Suppose a bagrister or a merchant, each making 5000*l.* a-year by his pursuit, and spending the whole sum as regularly as it was earned, without laying by any portion of it. Suppose at the same time a physician and a manufacturer, each making 5000*l.* a-year by his pursuit, and each living on half his income, and investing the surplus in realized property, in houses, lands, or funds. Can any thing be conceived more impolitic, or more unjust, than that the thoughtless spendthrifts, who lavish their incomes as fast as they receive them, should go untaxed; and that the thoughtful husbanders of a provision for their old age, or their children, should be taxed *because* of their prudence? The question can receive but one answer; for every one must perceive that so to act would be to pay a premium for improvidence, and to punish prudence and economy instead of giving them encouragement.

In the *Examiner* of March 31, 1833, in an excellent article on the Ministerial rejection of Mr. Robinson's Motion for a Committee, we find the following passage, which is so strictly in point, that we have great pleasure in introducing it here.

With regard to a tax on property in lieu of taxes pressing unduly on industry, we are advocates of such a change, provided that a mode of direct taxation can be devised, which, without being intolerable to the feelings of individuals, admits of the just apportionment of each person's payment to his means. But is this the object of all who ask for a property tax? By a property tax do not some of the number mean a tax upon certain *kinds* of property—a tax which shall fall exclusively upon land, houses, and money lent at interest? When they say that taxes ought not to be laid on industry, do they mean, what is both true and important, that taxes ought not to be laid so as to divert industry from one employment, or turn it artificially into another, or do they mean that no taxes whatever shall be paid by persons in business, and that such shall be wholly exempt from a share of the public burthens. If this *monstrous proposition* be intended, let it be avowed, and it shall be controverted. We countenance no schemes of injustice; and, should the occasion arise, are prepared to contend for the rights of the rich, as we have ever done, and ever shall do, for the rights and interests of the poor. Mr. Attwood likens the state of the country to that of a ship's crew, short of provisions;—supposing it to be so, it becomes us to practise the nicest economy, to apportion the shares with the justest hand, but not to prey upon each other, not to turn cut-throats and cannibals.

Give industry fair play; give wealth fair play; wealth is the reward of industry, and industry has its interest of manifold kinds in not damaging its object.

We would not cure one wrong by attempting another; because the industrious have had more than their share of the burthen, we would not with sheer undisguised injustice propose to transfer the load in mass to the rich solely. If it were said, do not tax those who work, tax those who do not work, the principle would be intelligible, but unjust. Those who do not work are often those who *cannot*; and instead of being peculiarly burthened, are fitter objects for being peculiarly spared. Those again, whose circumstances do not require them to work for their bread, often work for the public good, all the more efficiently, and in modes which would never answer as means of livelihood. Though the majority of those who can afford to be idle, always *are* idle, there is a minority which comprises the greatest benefactors and ornaments of the human race. Finally, almost all those who live and do no work, do so because they *have*

worked, they or their fathers before them. To take the burthen entirely off those who *are* working, and lay it wholly on those who *have* worked, is a poor mode of encouraging men to work, but a very effectual one of inducing them to *devour all they produce, and leave nothing for posterity.*

We concur entirely in the justice of this view; and when we consider that the great object of the change proposed, namely, to tax income and property instead of commodities, is to relieve the commercial and labouring classes from the great weight of the pressure that now bears so heavily upon them, we confess that it appears to us unjust and ungrateful in the extreme, for those very classes who are thus to be relieved to so great an extent, demand an *entire exemption* from bearing any share of the public burdens at all.

The next consideration, then, is the *rate* of such Taxation in the whole, and in parts. We will suppose 10 per cent. to be the *par*, or average standard of rate. Considering, however, that all persons having incomes of less than 100*l.* a-year might be fairly exempt; and that the population within the operation of the tax would not exceed three millions of male adults and heads of families, the rate should begin at 1 per cent. as the lowest, and go up gradually to 15 per cent. as the highest extreme. According to the present system of taxing the necessities of life, and leaving large masses of property untouched, although 10 per cent. may be the average rate at which the *whole* income of the country is taxed, there is this manifest injustice in the gradation of the scale, as it leaves the *par*, or average centre, and ascends or descends to either extreme. Assuming that the middle classes at present pay about 10 per cent. on their whole gains, it will be found, on *ascending* to the gentry, or class next above them, that they pay only about  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.; and, ascending still higher, the nobility, the more wealthy portion of the clergy, and the rich landholder and fundholder, pay about 5 per cent. only on the incomes they enjoy! Taking the *descending* direction, however, from the centre, or *par*, the scale *increases* as the poverty grows more *helpless*; and, accordingly, while the middle class of prosperous and substantial tradesmen may be supposed to pay 10 per cent., the hard-working artisan, and the small shopkeeper will pay from 15 to 20; and the labourer of the lowest class above the actual pauper, from 25 to 30 per cent., or nearly one-third of his miserable pittance, in the taxes on those articles of daily use and consumption, bread, meat, beer, tea, coffee, sugar, soap, candles, apparel, and other commodities which habit has rendered necessary to his comfort, if not to his very existence. Whatever objections, therefore, may exist to a *graduated* scale of Taxation, must exist in much greater force against the *present* system, than against any other that could be substituted in its place; for here we *have* a graduated scale from 5 per cent. to 25 per cent. on the incomes of the parties contributing—but in defiance of justice, humanity, and common sense, graduated the wrong way; making those who are the *richest* pay the *smallest* proportion of their incomes to the support of the state, and exacting from the *poorest* the *largest* proportion of their scanty store, to uphold the Government under which they live. Such a violation of all equity as this can surely never meet defenders.

We propose, then, to preserve the *principle of graduation*, which is not merely acknowledged but acted upon in our present system, and to *reverse* the order of its progress;—to begin by taxing the incomes of

the lowest class included in the scale, namely 100*l.* at 1 per cent. instead of 25, and end by taxing the incomes of the highest class, from 10,000*l.* to 300,000*l.* and upwards, at 3 and 15 per cent. instead of 5; acting, therefore, in conformity with the principle of proportion before laid down, namely, to lighten or increase the weight of the burden with as exact a regard as possible to the capacity of the parties to bear them.

When it is admitted that the great end of Government is to protect the persons and property of its subjects from foreign invasion and domestic spoil, it must be clear that those who have the largest possessions to protect, and the most numerous privileges to enjoy, *ought* to be the parties who should contribute, not merely most largely, but in the largest proportion to their income, for the support of the protection required.

Lord Althorp, Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Poulett Thompson, and others, have called this graduation of rate, "an equalization of all fortunes;" and a "confiscation of property;" neither of which are at all true. But we subjoin a higher authority than either, to counterbalance theirs. The celebrated Dr. Paley, writing on this subject, says,

"A tax, to be just, ought to be accurately proportioned to the circumstances (or more correctly, perhaps, to the amount of the property) of the persons who pay it. But, upon what, it might be asked, is this opinion founded: unless it could be shown, that such a proportion interferes the least with the general conveniency of subsistence? Whereas, I should rather believe, that a tax constructed with a view to that conveniency, ought to rise upon the different classes of the community, in a *much higher ratio* than the simple proportion of their incomes. The point to be regarded, is, not what men *have*, but what they can *spare*:—and it is evident, that a man who possesses a thousand pounds a-year, can *more easily* give up a hundred, than a man with a hundred pounds a-year can part with ten; that is, those habits of life which are reasonable and innocent, and upon the ability to continue which, the formation of families depends, will be *much less affected* by the one deduction, than by the other. It is still more evident, that a man of a hundred pounds a-year, would not be so much distressed in his subsistence, by a demand from him of ten pounds, as a man of ten pounds a-year, would be by the loss of one:—to which we must add, that, the population of the country being replenished by the marriages of the lowest ranks of the society, their accommodation and relief become of more importance to the state, than the conveniency of any higher, but less numerous, order of its citizens."

We have heard it often urged, that Property is fairly entitled to its just influence in the state: and when Property contributes its just share towards the maintenance of the expenses, we shall have no objection to see it invested with its due share of influence in the direction of public affairs. We have accordingly provided, in the Plan of a Graduated Tax proposed, that the possessors of large Incomes, whose rate of taxation is increased in proportion to the increase of their means, should be granted an additional number of votes, as Electors, in proportion to the per centage of tax actually paid by them; and be so registered in all boroughs or counties in which their residence or property may lie: thus giving them an increase of political power, in proportion to the weight of their contributions to the support of the State, and making that power legal, open, and acknowledged, instead of allowing it to be exercised, as it too often is at present, illegally, secretly, and degradingly, to all the parties concerned.

We have one other point only to advert to, before we introduce the

Table of the Plan proposed ; and it is that which raises an objection to an Income Tax, on account of its *inquisitorial* character, and the necessity under which it would place all men, of disclosing to others the actual state of their affairs. This objection would be entitled to some weight, if the present System of Taxation, for which that on Income is proposed as a substitute, were entirely free from any inquisitorial examinations into men's property, operations, and affairs. But let us see whether that is the case.

To begin with the least onerous of these inquisitorial processes, that of the Customs. No merchant can export or import any of the various articles subject to duties, without exposing to the proper officers, if required, his invoices, bills of lading, and all particulars of quantity and value, accompanied by bonds, oaths, visits of Custom-house officers to his docks, warehouses, and ships, and liability to be called on to give a full exposition of any matter or thing which these officers, in the course of their duties may require, besides being subject to seizures of his goods, and himself to penalties of all kinds, for any infraction of the laws, however unintentioned they may have been made.

Passing from thence to the Excise, the inquisitorial nature of its proceedings is far more searching and vexatious than that of the Customs. Manufactories of every kind are subject to the daily and nightly visits of its numerous and sharp-scented emissaries ;—processes of the utmost importance are retarded and interrupted to suit their convenience ;—private apartments, and even the persons of individuals arriving from abroad, are liable to be searched, upon bare suspicion of contraband articles being concealed in the places, or on the persons examined.

In the operation of the Assessed Taxes, the inquisitorial power is just as largely exercised, by inquiries being made into the rent of every man's house, by counting the number of his windows, to be determined often by actual inspection, by examining the nature and number of his carriages, his horses, servants, and even his dogs, and by the most vexatious investigations that can be conceived.

Can any thing be more inquisitorial than all this ? Even then, if the levying an Income Tax were but *as* inquisitorial as this, and not more so, its inquisitorial nature would be no fair objection to its adoption. But, we contend, that if those who are called upon to make returns of their income will but do so *honestly*, they never need fear a second visit from the returning officer or collector : and if they should *not* do so honestly, they would *deserve* to be visited, not merely with an inquisitorial examination into their affairs, but with severe penalties for attempting the fraudulent and cowardly injustice of escaping from the payment of their due share of the burthens of the State.

If, in an invasion by the common enemy, any citizen were to fly from his post, or decline to bear his full share of the heat and burthen of the defensive fight, he would be justly branded as a recreant, and shunned by all his neighbours. We are now invaded by a more powerful enemy than any that could attack us from without—INTERNAL DISTRESS—and the increasing spread of embarrassment, aug-

menting in amount and degree as it descends lower and lower in the scale of society. We are called upon to repel this common enemy by contributing, each man according to his strength; and, if it would be disgraceful in a time of siege for any one man to have his magazines and cellars filled with corn and wine in superabundance, while others were famishing for want of food; so is it equally disgraceful, under our present circumstances, for the rich to cling pertinaciously to the possession of their wealth, and not be ready to part with their due share of it for the preservation of the lives of others, and the protection of the remainder of that property, which they may then justly and fairly call their own.

But to make the inquiry into the Incomes of individuals as little inquisitorial as possible, and to allow a fair, and even an ample latitude for scrupulous and conscientious persons to make their returns in round sums, and without any unnecessary exposition of the minutiae of detail,—we have divided the Incomes into fifteen classes, each taxable at the rate of per centage given, from 1 to 15 per cent.; and as these classes are separated from each other by large distances, we propose that no individual should be called upon for any more specific return, than that of the sum which corresponds to the class within which his Income may fall; that is, for example, to state that it is above 100*l.* a-year, but not equal to 200*l.* a-year; above 200*l.* but not equal to 300*l.*; above 10,000*l.* but not equal to 10,500*l.*; above 5000*l.* but not equal to 10,000*l.*; above 200,000*l.* but not 250,000*l.*;—and so on, as in the Table hereafter given; the difference between the annual amounts becoming wider and wider, as the scale advances upward.

If there are persons so scrupulously secret with respect to the amount of their actual Incomes, as not to be willing to disclose them with such wide latitudes as these; and who would defraud the revenue of its just due, after such ample allowance for uncertainty, as these wide intervals—of hundreds between the lowest class of Incomes: of thousands between the middle class; and of tens of thousands between the higher class,—we must say that such *dishonest* persons—for dishonest towards the rest of their countrymen, and towards the common protector of all, the Government of the State, such persons must be—deserve no consideration; and if they cannot be persuaded into patriotism by generous motives, they deserve to be shamed into justice by other means, and compelled to bear their share of the burthen, in common with their countrymen at large.

We may add also, that though our Scale is called a Graduated Tax, yet in reality it is a perfectly equal one, being constructed upon this simple principle:—that the *first* 100*l.* of every man's income whether he had only 100*l.* or 300,000*l.* per annum should be taxed only at 1 per cent.; the second 100*l.* of his income taxed at 2 per cent.; the third 100*l.* at 3 per cent.; and so on—the increased rate on the third hundred not being applied to the second or the first; so that while the poor man's only 100*l.* would be taxed at 1 per cent. the rich man's first 100*l.* would be taxed no more than one per cent. also: and the increased rate of taxation would be only applicable to the increased income above any certain standard; a plan which combines the *justice* of taxing every man's first, or tenth, or fiftieth 100*l.* exactly

at the same rate throughout the whole community, and therefore possessing the most perfect equality; with the *policy* of taxing each increased 100*l.* or 500*l.* of every man's fortune, as it rises, at a higher rate than the preceding 100*l.* or 500*l.* above which it proceeds, and, *in that sense only*, being a Graduated Tax.

What will reconcile all, however, but the very rich, to the ready adoption of the plan, will be this: Let the reader look at the line in the following Table, in which his class of Income lies, in any grade of the Scale from 100*l.* per annum, up to 5000*l.* per annum. Let him then calculate what amount of taxes he pays now, in the duties of customs and excise, on most that he eats, drinks, and wears; in assessed taxes of every kind, as well as tithes, church-dues, county and parish rates for the maintenance of the poor (for all these are intended to be covered by the tax proposed), and sum up the whole. Let him then compare the *aggregate* amount with what he would have to pay on the new Scale, as set down in the Table, opposite to his Annual Income, in whatever class it may be; and we think he will be perfectly satisfied that *he*, at least, would be a gainer of considerable relief by the change, and be ready to hail its adoption as a blessing.

We have estimated the amount that would be produced by an Income Tax, thus graduated, and believe it would exceed 25,000,000*l.* at least. But whatever might be the sum, it is clear that taxes to the same amount, now pressing on the productive industry of the country, and affecting chiefly the poorer classes, might be at once taken off, and the spring which this would give to trade of every kind would be immense. If it fell short in the whole amount required to cover all the expenses of the state, no other change would be required, than a proportionate increase of the rates on all classes. If it exceeded what was needed, the relief would be found in a proportionate decrease of the rates;—so that instead of having the shipping interest fighting against the monied interest—the agricultural interest fighting against the manufacturing—and each quarrelling with the other who should bear the additional impost—or who enjoy the additional relief proposed—there would be but *one* interest in the state—and any increase of the public burthens by putting on a heavier rate of tax, or any decrease of them by taking off some portion of the existing rate—would be felt in just proportions by all—each according to their share of wealth in, and share of contributions to the state.

With these explanations, we think the Table will be sufficiently intelligible, and we therefore introduce it here.

## SCALE OF A GRADUATED TAX

*On Income—Life Annuity—and Property in Perpetuity—beginning at 1 and ending at 15 per cent. per annum; and leaving all Incomes below 100l. a-year untouched.*

Classes of Income in even Sums of 100l.	Tax on each 100l. rising in succession.	Total tax if on Incomes from precarious sources.	One third more if on Incomes fixed for life.	One-third more if on Incomes from Perpetuities.	Electoral Votes to each Class.
£ 100	1	£ 1	£ s. d. 1 6 8	£ s. d. 1 13 4	1
200	2	3	4 0 0	5 0 0	1
300	3	6	8 0 0	10 0 0	2
400	4	10	13 6 8	16 13 4	2
500	5	15	20 0 0	25 0 0	3
600	5	20	26 13 4	33 6 8	3
700	6	26	34 13 4	43 6 8	4
800	6	32	42 13 4	53 6 8	4
900	6	38	50 13 4	63 6 8	4
1000	7	45	60 0 0	75 0 0	5
1100	7	52	69 6 8	86 13 4	5
1200	7	59	78 13 4	98 6 8	5
1300	8	67	89 6 8	111 13 4	6
1400	8	75	100 0 0	125 0 0	6
1500	8	83	110 13 4	138 6 8	6
1600	9	92	122 13 4	153 6 8	7
1700	9	101	134 13 4	168 6 8	7
1800	9	110	146 13 4	183 6 8	7
1900	9	119	158 13 4	198 6 8	7
2000	10	129	172 0 0	215 0 0	8
2100	10	139	185 6 8	231 13 4	8
2200	10	149	198 13 4	248 6 8	8
2300	10	159	212 0 0	265 0 0	9
2400	10	169	225 6 8	281 13 4	9
2500	10	179	238 13 4	298 6 8	9
2600	10	189	252 0 0	315 0 0	10
2700	10	199	265 6 8	331 13 4	10
2800	10	209	278 13 4	348 6 8	10
2900	10	219	292 0 0	365 0 0	10
3000	11	230	306 13 4	383 6 8	11
3100	11	241	321 6 8	401 13 4	11
3200	11	253	337 6 8	421 13 4	11
3300	11	264	352 0 0	440 0 0	12
3400	11	275	366 13 4	458 6 8	12
3500	11	286	381 6 8	476 13 4	12
3600	11	297	396 0 0	495 0 0	13
3700	11	308	410 13 4	513 6 8	13
3800	11	319	425 6 8	532 13 4	13
3900	11	330	440 0 0	550 0 0	13
4000	12	342	456 0 0	570 0 0	14
4100	12	354	472 0 0	590 0 0	14

Classes of Income in even Sums of 100l.	Tax on each 100l. rising in succession.	Total Tax if on Incomes from pre-ca-sious sources.	One-third more if on Incomes fixed for Life.		One-third more if on Incomes from Perpetuities.		Electoral Votes to each Class.
£		£	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	
4200	12	366	488	0 0	610	0 0	15
4300	12	378	504	0 0	630	0 0	
4400	12	390	520	0 0	650	0 0	
4500	12	402	536	0 0	670	0 0	16
4600	12	414	552	0 0	690	0 0	
4700	12	426	568	0 0	710	0 0	
4800	12	438	584	0 0	730	0 0	
4900	12	450	600	0 0	750	0 0	
5000	13	463	617	6 8	772	13 4	17
5100	13	476	634	13 4	793	6 8	18
5200	13	489	652	0 0	815	0 0	
5300	13	502	669	6 8	837	13 4	
5400	13	515	686	13 4	858	6 8	
5500	13	528	704	0 0	880	0 0	19
5600	13	541	721	6 8	901	13 4	
5700	13	554	738	13 4	923	6 8	
5800	13	567	756	0 0	945	0 0	
5900	13	580	773	6 8	967	13 4	20
6000	13	593	790	13 4	988	6 8	
6100	13	606	808	0 0	1010	0 0	
6200	13	619	825	6 8	1032	13 4	
6300	13	632	842	13 4	1053	6 8	21
6400	13	645	860	0 0	1075	0 0	
6500	13	658	877	6 8	1097	13 4	
6600	13	671	894	13 4	1118	6 8	
6700	13	684	912	0 0	1140	0 0	22
6800	13	697	929	6 8	1162	13 4	
6900	13	710	946	13 4	1183	6 8	
7000	13	723	964	0 0	1205	0 0	
7100	13	736	981	6 8	1226	13 4	23
7200	13	749	998	13 4	1238	6 8	
7300	13	762	1016	6 8	1270	0 0	
7400	13	775	1033	6 8	1292	13 4	
7500	14	789	1052	0 0	1315	0 0	25
7600	14	803	1070	13 4	1338	6 8	26
7700	14	817	1090	6 8	1363	13 4	
7800	14	831	1108	0 0	1385	0 0	
7900	14	845	1126	13 4	1408	6 8	
8000	14	859	1145	6 8	1431	13 4	27
8100	14	873	1164	0 0	1455	0 0	
8200	14	887	1182	13 4	1478	6 8	
8300	14	901	1201	6 8	1501	13 4	
8400	14	915	1220	0 0	1525	0 0	28
8500	14	929	1238	13 4	1548	6 8	
8600	14	943	1257	6 8	1572	13 4	
8700	14	957	1276	0 0	1595	0 0	
8800	14	971	1294	13 4	1618	6 8	29
8900	14	985	1313	6 8	1641	13 4	
9000	14	999	1332	0 0	1665	0 0	
9100	14	1013	1350	13 4	1688	6 8	
9200	14	1027	1369	6 8	1711	13 4	30
9300	14	1041	1388	0 0	1735	0 0	
							31



Classes of Income in even Sums of 100£.	Tax on each 100£. rising in succession.	Total Tax if on Incomes from precarious sources.	One-third more if on Incomes fixed for Life.			One-third more if on Incomes from Perpetuities.			Electoral Votes to each Class.
£		£	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	
9400	14	1055	1406	13	4	1758	6	8	32
9500	14	1069	1425	6	8	1782	13	4	
9600	14	1083	1444	0	0	1805	0	0	
9700	14	1097	1462	13	4	1828	6	8	
9800	14	1111	1481	6	8	1851	13	4	33
9900	14	1125	1500	0	0	1875	0	0	
10,000	15	1140	1520	0	0	1900	0	0	34
10,500	15	1215	1620	0	0	2025	0	0	
11,000	15	1290	1720	0	0	2150	0	0	
11,500	15	1365	1820	0	0	2275	0	0	35
12,000	15	1440	1920	0	0	2400	0	0	
12,500	15	1515	2020	0	0	2525	0	0	36
13,000	15	1590	2120	0	0	2650	0	0	
13,500	15	1665	2220	0	0	2775	0	0	37
14,000	15	1740	2320	0	0	2900	0	0	
14,500	15	1815	2420	0	0	3025	0	0	38
15,000	15	1890	2520	0	0	3150	0	0	
20,000	15	1965	2620	0	0	3275	0	0	39
21,000	15	2115	2820	0	0	3525	0	0	
22,000	15	2265	3020	0	0	3775	0	0	40
23,000	15	2415	3220	0	0	4025	0	0	
24,000	15	2565	3420	0	0	4275	0	0	41
25,000	15	2715	3620	0	0	4525	0	0	
27,500	15	3090	4120	0	0	5150	0	0	42
30,000	15	3465	4620	0	0	5775	0	0	
35,000	15	4215	5620	0	0	6925	0	0	43
40,000	15	4965	6620	0	0	8275	0	0	
45,000	15	5715	7620	0	0	9525	0	0	44
50,000	15	6465	8620	0	0	10,775	0	0	
60,000	15	7965	10,620	0	0	13,275	0	0	45
70,000	15	9465	12,620	0	0	15,775	0	0	
80,000	15	10,965	14,620	0	0	18,275	0	0	46
90,000	15	12,465	16,620	0	0	20,775	0	0	
100,000	15	13,965	18,620	0	0	23,275	0	0	47
125,000	15	17,715	23,620	0	0	29,525	0	0	
150,000	15	21,465	28,620	0	0	35,775	0	0	48
175,000	15	25,215	33,620	0	0	42,025	0	0	
200,000	15	28,965	38,620	0	0	48,275	0	0	49
250,000	15	36,465	48,620	0	0	60,775	0	0	
300,000	15	43,965	58,620	0	0	65,275	0	0	50

A Scale of Taxation, graduated as in the foregoing Table, would produce, we believe, 25,000,000£. sterling at least; but we give this only as an Estimate, approximating as nearly as our means of calculation will admit, to the truth. The exact numbers of each class, and the exact amount of the Incomes of each, cannot, of course, be accurately ascertained, without an actual Return from every county, town, and parish, in the kingdom. But as the Government have all the machinery for this purpose already in their hands; as the Schedules left by the collectors of the Assessed Taxes, and the books of the overseers of the Poor in all parts of the country, would furnish the necessary in-

formation as to the *persons* from whom such Returns should be called for,—all that would be necessary to obtain the most perfect information, would be to command that a certain Schedule, prepared for this purpose, should be left at every dwelling in the kingdom; and its filling up and return to the proper officers fixed for a certain date. The following Form would appear to us to embrace all that could be desired.

## SCHEDULE.

The Renter or Occupier of the House, No. — in — Street, in the Township, Parish, Ward, or District of — is required to fill up this Schedule, with a Return of his Income, as prescribed: and to furnish each of the Persons residing on his premises, and above the age of twenty-one years, with a Blank Copy of the same, for the purpose of their making a Return of their Individual Incomes, according to the Form given:—the Renter or Occupier of the House being held responsible for such Returns being all sent into the Office of — in — on or before the — day of — in the year — under a penalty of — in case of his neglecting so to do, within the time named.

Delivered at the House named above, on the — day of —  
(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_

Collector of Taxes.

Name.	Age.	Profession.	Annual Income from Profession or Trade.		Annual Income from Annuities, Pensions, or Life Interest only.		Annual Income for Lands, Funds, and Perpetuities.	
			Above.	Above.	Above.	Above.	Above.	Above.
			£.	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.

## SOLEMN DECLARATION. \*

I — do solemnly declare the above to be a true and faithful Return of the full amount of income received by me during the past year; and of the proportions in which it was derived; from the exercise of Professional labour, or profits on Trade: for Annuities or Pensions for Life only; and from fixed Property in Lands, Houses, Funds, or other permanent Sources: and that the return is made in perfect honour and good faith, without any concealment, reservation, or evasion whatever, and with a full knowledge of the legal penalties attached to the conviction of presenting a false Return.

Dated — the — day of — in the year of our Lord —  
(Signed) \_\_\_\_\_

A condition might be annexed to this, that any person suspected of giving in a total amount of Income so much less than his real gain, as to make it fall into a lower scale of per centage, or into a lower class than that in which its real amount would place it, should be liable to be called before Commissioners appointed for that purpose, with this condition, that if proved to have so falsified the Return, to the extent named, he should be liable to a penalty of double the amount due from him on his actual yearly income; one half of the penalty to go to the revenue, and the other half to the party proving the fraud. And, on the other hand, if it were not proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioners that a falsification of the Return, to the extent named

had taken place, the accusing party should then be liable to the penalty of double the amount of the Return made—one half to go to the revenue, and the other half to the party unjustly subjected to the false imputation.

To make the operation of this Tax as fairly and equitably extensive as possible, it should be made to include every British subject, wherever residing, whose Income was derivable from fixed property or funds in this country, or from pay, emolument, or pension, derived from the British Government. It should, therefore, embrace the whole of the Salaries paid out of the Civil List, including the King, and all the members of the Royal Family—the Judges and great officers of State,—the Governors and officers of all our Colonial Dependencies—the officers of the Navy and Army, wherever serving—the Dignitaries of the Law and the Church—the Sinecurists and Pensioners of every class and grade:—in short, every person above the age of twenty-one, whose Income should be derived from landed, or funded, or any other description of property or trade, in England, Scotland, or Ireland; or whose pay, pension, or emoluments, should come from the Treasury of Great Britain, and be paid out of the General Revenue, wheresoever they resided, or to whatever other Government they might contribute their share of taxation. The justice of this extension of its operation must be evident: for as the object of taxation is to pay for the protection of property and the safety of the State, and as no classes can be more deeply interested than those we have named, in so securing the very sources from whence their Incomes are derived, it is but fair that they should contribute, in as large a proportion, according to the amount of their Incomes, as any other class in the realm: and through the same channel as their remittances, of rents, interests from the funds, pay, pension, or other emoluments, were conveyed or payed to them—through the same channels could this Schedule be transmitted, and the Return to it obtained; any failure to reply to which, within the proper time, might be visited with the penalty of double the amount of Income Tax assessed, being deducted from their sources of supply.

That this, and every other Plan first brought before the public eye, must be susceptible of subsequent improvement, it would be presumptuous to deny. But we have read nearly all the books and pamphlets written on the subject—we have heard and considered attentively the debate on Mr. Robinson's motion, embodying the most opposite and the most recent views on this question, and we do not hesitate to say, that while the principle of an Income Tax is here carried to its fullest extent, the *details* are all of a perfect practicable nature; so that the requisite Returns might be called for, and the whole of the machinery put into full operation in a month.

Let us see, then, whether, in recapitulation, this plan of a graduated Income or Property Tax, as proposed, would not correspond with all the principles of just taxation before laid down.

1. All parties in the state contributing to its expenses in proportion to their wealth, all parties would have the deepest interest in economy; and every one would use his efforts to see the smallest amount possible taken from the people, consistent with the safety of the state.

2. The tax would be the *simplest* imaginable, as it would be only on one thing, and that consolidated with substantial political privi-

leges, attached to every class in proportion to the sum paid by each. It would be so *intelligible*, that every child in the kingdom might understand it, and no possible loss could arise in questions of property and trade, as daily happens now, from ignorance and error of the nature and bearing of the taxes, duties, bounties, drawbacks, &c.

3. The tax would be *certain and economical in its collection*, as one register-office, one receiver-general, and a dozen clerks, in each county, would be all the machinery necessary for that purpose. The payment should be once a-year only, say the 5th of April; and the persons required to make their returns and payment should either go to the office themselves for that purpose, or send their documents and cash through their agents or bankers, and not require to be waited on by the officers of government. And if at the close of the payments made for each year, a list of the names, professions, and sums paid by each, were to be published in the County Gazette, or General Register, as in the case of the game certificates at present, no further security against omissions would be required. The business of the year being thus at an end, the office might be shut up for nine months, if necessary, as there would be really nothing to do in the collection of taxes until the commencement of the registration for the next year at least. To avoid even this slight expense falling on the state, if a small fee of only five shillings on each Annual Return made and Receipt given (3,000,000) were to be paid, (which Receipt of the Tax paid would be the only proof of legal qualification required for the Registration of all the Electoral Votes) it would exceed 700,000*l.*, and maintain 100 register-offices at 7000*l.* a-year each, so as to save all expense whatever in the collection, and make the revenue come into the treasury without a single shilling of deduction.

4. The tax would be *impossible to be evaded*, as men cannot, like bales of goods, or casks of spirits, be smuggled from house to house, or from city to city; they must be seen every day in their usual occupations, and their residences known to all their neighbours; and the absence of any individual's name in the column or page of the class to which he belonged, when the Lists were published in his county or parish, would be as fatal to his reputation as his name now appearing among the bankrupts in the Gazette.

5. The tax would be *extremely favourable to consumption*; for as it would be a substitute for all others, there would be no duties of any kind or sort whatever; neither on articles of food nor of clothing; neither on dwellings nor furniture; neither on materials for manufactures, nor on shipping for conveying them; but every thing would be equally free, and consequently every thing as cheap as its natural value only could make it. The consumption of every article now in use could not fail to be greatly augmented by this, and consequently the labour of men of every class employed in their preparation would be in full demand, so that our agriculture and manufactures might then equally rival all others in the world; while every increase to our population would, as long as employment existed for them, be an increase of national wealth, by their annual contributions to the treasury, as well as of natural strength in their numbers and force.

6. The tax would be as nearly as possible *in proportion to people's means of paying it*; this, indeed, being the basis on which the whole plan is formed.

At all events this must be clear, that by the plan here proposed, the whole of the revenue might be raised with much greater ease than the same sum is now exacted from the people; since the capital and labour that can and does pay the whole revenue now, by a costly and unjust process, could surely raise the same amount in a cheaper and juster one; while—instead of burthening any one branch of industry, or setting in battle array against each other the conflicting interests of particular classes, or oppressing the poor and permitting the rich to escape—it would set the industry of all classes free; it would create a prodigious demand for labour, by the increased consumption of every manufacture in which labour is required; it would set at rest for ever all the angry contests between the landed and the monied—the shipping and the manufacturing interests; and it would also relieve our colonies, by the consumption of their produce, as much as the mother country, by the relief for its industry in return.

We cannot close the observations, however, without adverting to a few of the beneficial effects which it would produce, as we believe, in the habits and feelings of all classes of society—from the very lowest to the very highest.

To begin with the lowest.—The most deep-rooted cause of the feelings of disrespect—not to say hatred—which many among the lower classes of society bear towards the higher, is their knowledge of the fact, that while all the wealth of the rich is created by the labour of the poor, yet the rich, not content with this, turn round upon the poor, and, in legislating for the country, so arrange the imposition of the Taxes, as that they, the rich, shall pay the smallest proportion of their income towards them, and that the heaviest shall be thrown upon the poor. They feel, therefore, that the rich are *ungrateful* to those by whose labour they live; and they quote the high authority of that excellent churchman, Dr. Paley, who, in his treatise on Moral Philosophy, says:—

It is a mistake to suppose that the rich man maintains his servants, tenants, tradesmen, and labourers; the truth is, they maintain him. It is their industry which supplies his table, furnishes his wardrobe, builds his houses, adorns his equipage, provides his amusements. It is not the estate, but the labour employed upon it, that pays his rent. All that he does is to *distribute* what others *produce*, which is the least part of the business.—vol. i. p. 240.

They perceive also, in the law of primogeniture, a provision for keeping landed property in large masses, so as to enrich one member of each great family, and make all the rest his dependents; the result of which is, that the head of the family becomes a legislator by virtue of his birth alone, without any reference whatever to his fitness, and without any responsibility to others for his conduct; and that in his capacity as a legislator, he keeps up the corn laws, because his income is derived from high rents;—he defends the East India Monopoly, because he shares a portion of its patronage;—he upholds West Indian Slavery, because he has in Jamaica large sugar plantations;—he resists Poor Laws in Ireland, because he holds landed estates in that island so.—he will hear nothing of Reform in the Church, because he has a large property in Tithes,—not to speak of livings, and other good things in his gift: and he will hear of no retrenchment in the Civil List, no lessening of diplomatic expense, no curtailment of the Navy or Army, no abolition of sine-

cures, no cutting off of pensions, because all these are the very sources on which he relies for providing for his younger brothers;—and, while spending for himself the whole produce of the paternal estate, he can keep up the dignity of his noble family, by fastening his brothers and sisters, nephews and nieces, sons and daughters,—either on the service or the pension list, as vacancies may occur.

The lower classes of the people know all this, because they see it with their own eyes, and feel it in their own persons; and we do not wonder that they regard the rich with any thing but respect or good will.

The adoption of such a System of Taxation as the one we propose, by relieving the poor at once and entirely from the operation of any tax whatever, up at least to incomes of 100*l.* a-year, and, even then, pressing them only with the lightness of a feather, and making the rich contribute their just proportion to the burthens of the State, would so far change their relative positions, as to do more than any thing else we can conceive to lessen the disrespect, and abate the hatred, which now reigns among the poor, and gradually substitute kinder and better feelings in their stead.

On the rich it would have a different, but a very salutary, effect.—It would make them, what nothing else would do, Economists of the Public Expenditure: and why?—Simply, because they would be large payers towards its support. Hitherto they have been so lightly touched themselves, that they could see nothing in Public Economy, but a vulgar reverence for pounds, shillings, and pence. Only place them in the situation of the *payers* instead of the *receivers* of the taxes, and the revolution will be as great as could be achieved by the magician's wand. The budget would be scrutinized by an entirely new class of men, and Mr. Hume would have more coadjutors among the rich landowners and fundholders of the Lords and Commons, than would ever be brought to act with him by any other motive.

With both classes—the rich and the poor—it would have the effect of inducing habits of scrutiny and regularity in their accounts; it would not merely inspire the wish, but draw forth exertions, to make the income of each succeeding year something more than that which went before:—no one would like to fall from the scale or class in which he first stood, but all would be glad to rise: and as, when men are really advancing in prosperity, they take some pains to let their neighbours know the agreeable fact, and do justice to their prudence or their skill, so improving incomes would lead to improving returns, and the *habit* of honourable willingness to pay their full share of the public burthens, and see their names appear, with a becoming annual income opposite to them, in the published Lists in the County Gazette, would so grow in strength, that the frauds and evasions of smuggling would rarely be known, and, when detected, be visited with public scorn; while the same honourable anxiety, which makes a man, when he subscribes his annual donation to a public charity or a hospital, see that his name is entered in the right class;—that, if a Governor, he is not put among the ordinary Members, and that his rank as well as the amount of his annual donation is accurately reported,—would induce him also to see that his income was published at the full amount at which he returned it, and his annual contribution to the burthens of

the State, and the rank as to the number of his Electoral Votes, not omitted in the County or Parish List, in which his name might annually appear.

As to the benefits which would arise from the adoption of this System of Taxation, in a commercial point of view, it would be difficult for the most sanguine imagination to picture the result. To see British ships built wholly of untaxed materials, British manufactures conducted through wholly untaxed processes; no Custom Houses, or landing waiters, to tax the raw materials imported into our harbours; no Excise Officers, or inland surveyors, to gauge and weigh and measure every man's stock in trade, and examine his licence to deal in exciseable articles; no Coast Blockade, to prevent the free entrance from abroad of cheap corn, cheap wine, cheap tea, cheap coffee, cheap sugar, and cheap every thing else, since all things would come to us at their untaxed price, and all things go from us unburthened with impost or duty. Of such a state of things—and the mere adoption of this system of Taxing Income only, and abolishing every other species of tax, would bring such a state of things about—it is difficult to form a conception. But this at least we might safely predict, that it would fill our harbours with the ships of all nations, without lessening the occupation of our own, that it would so increase the demand for labour, that all our manufactories would be in full employ, and that the active and industrious portion of the nation, at least, would feel like a patient awakening from a disordered sleep, and shaking off the night-mare of disease, going forth to walk abroad, with freedom, life, and vigour; and while breathing with new lungs the freshness of the morning air, gathering health, strength, and enjoyment, at every step he advanced.

---

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR.

---

### STRIKING INSTANCE OF THE CRUELITIES INFLICTED BY IMPRESSMENT.

SIR,

*Harwich, March, 1834.*

I beg leave to mention one instance of the blessed effect of Impressment, which came under my knowledge. In the latter part of 1810, His Majesty's ship, *Agincourt*, being ordered to proceed to Harwich, to take on board troops, to convey them to Lisbon, received, just previous to sailing, a draft of men from the guard-ship, at the Nore, among whom were a number of men recently impressed. As the ship could not go into the harbour, the troops were sent on board in small vessels, and it being dark, some few of the new draft found means, in the confusion, to stow away in the small craft, and desert. One poor fellow, who had been noticed as having been particularly depressed in spirits, (which we only considered natural, as having been newly impressed), was missing, and we supposed he had got away with the others; but in a day or two after, he was found dead, in the heart of the Hawser, coiled up in the tier, where he had evidently stowed himself away, to indulge in his grief, and I have no doubt he died broken-hearted.

J. F.

## PETITIONS IN FAVOUR OF THE CLAIMS OF THE DISSENTERS.

SIR,

*Gornal, near Dudley, March 21, 1834.*

I beg respectfully to state that your parliamentary conduct has recently been of such a character as to attract the notice and meet the approbation of the large body of Dissenters in this neighbourhood, as well as in many other parts of the country, and I fondly trust that you will continue to pursue the line of conduct you seem to have marked out for yourself. Half measures, and men who can compromise the interests of their constituents, will not do for the present day. Hence it has been matter of deep regret to many thousands in this quarter, that His Majesty's Ministers have manifested such a seeming coldness toward the Dissenters, and that the Marriage Bill, introduced by them, is nothing short of an insult to their best friends. It is so unwise in its construction, and so vexatious, invidious, and unjust in its leading provisions, as to mock the just claims of the persons for whose benefit it is professedly intended.

It is to be hoped that Ministers will mark well the ground on which they stand, that in giving way to Tory influence, either in Church or State, and setting aside their supporters, they are sealing their own fate, and exposing the nation to all that is distracting in change, and horrible in a revolution. At the same time it is the duty of every statesman to be true to his constituents—true to his country—true to the cause of Civil and Religious Liberty, and true to his God; and proving himself thus faithful, he will rise to honour—be the ornament of society and the pillar of the State.

My chief object in addressing you is, that a petition, got up at a large meeting of Dissenters, is now receiving signatures, and it is intended to intrust it to you for presentation to the House of Commons, soon after the Easter Recess. Though the petition does not pray for the separation of Church and State, yet it expresses freely the views of the petitioners relative to national establishments of religion, and prays for the removal of our grievances. I have no doubt but you will readily support its prayer.

Should your time permit, it would be gratifying to many in this quarter if you would briefly state in your REVIEW the present position of affairs as to the Dissenters' claims, and if there is a probability of their getting a complete measure this session.

I have the honour to remain, yours, most respectfully,

A PROTESTANT DISSENTER.

[We hope to take an opportunity during the Recess of going into this subject more at large, and shall then state our views as to the actual position of the Dissenters; but at the present moment we do not think they will obtain any large measure of general satisfaction, unless by pressing their claims with incessant activity and earnestness.—EDITOR.]

## SIR ANDREW AGNEW'S BILL.—REMOVAL OF FAIRS AND MARKETS.

SIR,

*Croydon, March 24, 1834.*

From your vote in favour of Sir Andrew Agnew's motion for a bill to enable the local authorities to change the days of Fairs and Markets, held on Saturdays and Mondays, to other days, I am sure you cannot have well considered the subject; in this assertion I am borne out by the following, from your PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW of Saturday last.

“That the observance of one day of rest in seven, is a highly beneficial institution, in a physical and moral point of view, quite apart from religious considerations, we have no doubt whatever; and we think it could be demonstrated to be highly advantageous to all parties in the state; but as to any particular mode of enjoying that day of rest, it must, we think, be left to the individual himself to choose; always taking care, of course, to protect the public health, public morals,



and the public peace, from violation, by any gross abuse of the privilege which this day of rest conferred."

Now, I fear when you voted for the motion, you could not have possessed the liberal views you did when writing the above; however, if I am not intruding too much on your time, allow me to point out an objection or two, to changing the Saturdays' and Mondays' fairs and markets. The first and great objection to disturbing the markets on Saturdays is, the advantages they afford to populous towns of obtaining a fresh and good supply of domestic articles, which if on any other day, would be of little or no accommodation to them, for many would be without money, and others, from habit and convenience, would be deprived of its advantages, through being compelled to provide on the Sunday for the greater part of the week.—As respects fairs, I think the objections, if possible, greater, particularly to giving the power of changing the days to the local authorities, for at present, the fairs are in many instances so arranged and connected with each other, that cattle can be driven through the country (if not sold), so as conveniently to attend two or three fairs per week; this arrangement might be maintained, but if left to the local authorities, I doubt whether there would be any convenience studied but their own.

To give you an idea of the great difficulty attending an alteration of markets, I will cite the connexion of our market (Croydon) with those of London and the country markets in this part; I must observe that ours is on Saturday, and supported by agriculturists, and dealers in their produce; many of the farmers, and most of the dealers also attending the London markets three days in the week, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday; on Tuesday they attend Reigate market, and on Thursday East Grinstead market, consequently, having the six days fully occupied—in what way can it be possible to change two of these large markets, or to spare two days in six, without causing such a sacrifice as it would be impossible for the legislature to compensate!

There are many other difficulties that strike me, and shall be happy to submit them should you condescend to notice the above.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

W. G.

[We readily give insertion to the letter of our Correspondent, and we can assure him that when we wrote the passage adverted to, and when we voted, we were in exactly the same frame of mind. We have always been of opinion that in matters purely religious, such as that of what may be called the spiritual or devotional observance of the Lord's Day, every man should be left to the dictates of his own conscience, as to whether he would attend any particular place of worship, or indeed whether he would join in any religious worship at all. At the same time, regarding the institution of a Sabbath of Rest as of the highest advantage to the health, morals, and comfort of the community, we would assist the legislature in making such laws as should facilitate the enjoyment of that rest to man and beast—and if the sacrifice of some pecuniary interest should be required for that purpose—we would let that have due weight in making any change, but would still adhere to the principle that as far as it is practicable it is desirable to preserve the repose of the Sabbath.—EDITOR.]

## PROPOSED PLAN OF OBTAINING THE SUPPORT OF TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES BY PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT.

SIR,

*Sunderland, March 22, 1834.*

I perceive by the newspapers that you have given notice of a motion for a Select Committee of the House of Commons "to inquire into the causes of the great increase of habitual drunkenness among the labouring classes of the kingdom, and to devise legislative preventatives against the further spread of this great national evil."

I am glad that you are thus about to redeem the pledge you gave at the public meeting of the Temperance Society at Sunderland, on your late visit; and I beg to suggest a plan, of which I have long entertained a favourable idea, and which is highly approved by some persons to whom I have mentioned it. It is this:—That all the Temperance Societies in the United Kingdom should, as *Temperance Societies*, petition the Legislature on the subject, and forward their petitions to the House of Commons to the hands of their respective members, so that they may all be presented before your motion comes on. The subject of Temperance might be incidentally discussed with advantage on the presenting of every petition; especially as it is new to the House: this course would keep public attention alive to the subject; and whatever impression might be made on the House, much good would result from it *out of doors*. This preliminary examination was practised with great effect immediately before the passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, the Reform Bill, and on many other occasions.

I dare say you will agree with me, that it is most desirable that the friends of Temperance should act *simultaneously*; and surely there cannot be a more favourable juncture for them to bestir themselves, than when a member of the House of Commons is about to call the attention of the Legislature to the subject. Perhaps if the London Temperance Society were to send a circular to all the branch societies with which it is in correspondence, the end at which I aim might be arrived at. And if I might be permitted to give one more hint, I would say, that petitions, *couched in general terms*, and not prescribing any particular course, would be most judicious.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your very obedient, humble servant,

A FRIEND OF TEMPERANCE.

P. S.—It might not be amiss for all friends of Temperance, whether members of a Temperance Society or not, to be allowed to sign the petitions, which might run thus:—"The petition of the undersigned members of the [Sunderland] Temperance Society, and other friends of Temperance, resident in [Sunderland]."

[We concur entirely in the sensible and business-like view of this matter taken by our intelligent Correspondent, and strongly recommend his suggestions for adoption. As the motion is fixed for Tuesday, the 20th of May, there will be abundant time to obtain the fullest expression of public opinion, as well as abundant evidence on the subject from all parts of the country; and we shall be glad to have our hands strengthened by such support as all the friends of this motion, which must include all those who desire to see disease, and suffering, and crime abated through the land can give.

It may be added, that in forwarding petitions, it is *always* best that every town and county should send its petition to *their own* members, though they may of course ask others to support it, as this ensures the most extensive and varied attention to the subject, and often makes the members themselves acquainted with facts and arguments which they would not learn through any other channel, besides diversifying the topics as well as speakers in every successive case. To avoid expense of carriage, the petition should be done up, *open at both ends* like a newspaper, and written on the outside, above the direction, "*PETITION TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS*," and if addressed to the member of the place from whence the petition comes, and sent by post, it will be delivered free of charge. If petitions are very bulky, it is usual to send them as parcels, *carriage paid*, by coach.

As the sin of Drunkenness is productive of quite as much moral evil and actual guilt as slavery, it would be fully as appropriate an object for the labours of religious bodies to hasten its abolition. We should hope, therefore, that the Pulpit would co-operate with the Press in this "*labour of love*," and that every Minister of the Gospel, of whatever denomination, would explain to his congregation the duty of aiding any effort to enlist the Legislature in this holy work.—  
EDITOR.]

# DESTRUCTIVE EFFECTS OF ARDENT SPIRITS ON THE HEALTH AND MORALS OF THE COMMUNITY.

SIR,

Edinburgh, March 25, 1834.

I HAVE observed in the newspapers that you have given notice of a motion relative to the increase of drunkenness in Great Britain. I take the liberty of enclosing a document, a copy of which I presume you have already received, but which it is just possible you may have overlooked or lost. I printed it at my own expense, and sent a sufficient number of copies to London, to supply every member of both houses, and the Committee of the British and Foreign Temperance Society kindly agreed to address them. This was before the commencement of the Session. The document contains the testimony of 439 medical men, and I have by me the similar testimony of 54 more (from Bath and Weymouth), making a total of 493. This testimony as to the inevitable tendency of ardent spirits to produce disease, poverty, and wretchedness is *overwhelming*, for no member in the House would dare to deny the evidence of 493 *professional men*. My object in first taking up the *health* department of the question was, with a view to force at once on the House, evidence that could not be questioned, and to furnish *some* data for any member to proceed upon who might enter upon the general subject.

I am now collecting materials to show the connexion between intemperance and crime, and shall adopt the same mode of conveying the result of my inquiries to the Legislature.

I have before me a letter from the celebrated Dr. Cheyne, of date October 18, 1833, in which he says,

"I examined returns from upwards of 50 regiments, to queries which I drew up relative to the influence of ardent spirits, in relaxing discipline and leading to punishment; and it appears that nearly all the crimes in the army are owing to the use of spirits; and that flogging might be dispensed with, could any method be discovered of preventing the soldier from drinking ardent spirits."

(Signed)

J. CHEYNE.

I am enabled to state, upon the authority of the Treasurer of the Charity Workhouse, that the *greater part* of the money raised by the poor's assessment in this city, and which he distributed to the poor, goes into the low tippling-shops. This fact speaks for itself, and illustrates the working of the present system, and you will observe that it rests upon the *best* authority.

At the present moment, in this city, the number of persons brought into the city police-office for *mere protection*, in a state of beastly intoxication, amounts to twelve or thirteen daily. \* Drunken cases brought up for *punishment* in January last, amounted to 382.

I think, from the evidence that has been accumulated upon this subject, it may be asserted that exactly as the use of spirits is encouraged or permitted, so will be the amount of crime, disease, want, and misery.

In a post or two I hope to be able to communicate some useful information. In the mean time I beg to subscribe myself,

Your very obedient servant,

R. K. GREVILLE.

SIR,

York, March, 24, 1834.

I rejoice to observe that you have given two very important notices of motions in the House of Commons, one relating to habitual Drunkenness amongst the labouring classes of the kingdom, and the other for a Reduction of the National Debt. As the nation charges itself with the relief of the poor, I conceive it is justified in punishing improvidence which increases the burdens of the in-

dustrious, to say nothing about the duty of a Government to check vice and immorality. That something must be done with the National Debt, is evident; for if the fundholders are permitted any longer to receive 30s. in the pound, which Peel's infamous bill has given them, the end will be, that they will be deprived of what is fairly due to them. The public say the fundholders have no more right to rob the nation than the nation has to rob the fundholders, and that an equitable adjustment shall be made. When this event takes place the great sufferers will be those who have recently invested, for the public will treat with the fundholders as a body, calculating what they have received beyond their due, by the operation of Peel's Bill, and also the amount of taxation due from them, which would reduce the Debt at least one-half. People before they purchase into the funds should consider what they are buying.

I hope your zeal for the public good will induce you to make the attempt to prohibit British subjects from investing their property in foreign funds. A poor sailor is hanged if he happen to be found on board a foreign ship of war, when the cause probably is, the niggardly manner in which his own country thinks proper to reward him for his services, in order that it may have more to lavish on the aristocracy, therefore why should not the capitalist who assists foreign powers with money, share the same fate. The latter is by far the greatest traitor, although he defends his conduct by stating that we were at peace when he lent his money. Should we go to war with Russia that infamous power will fight us with British capital.

I also think much good would result from an extension of the Legacy Tax to landed property, if the Government cannot afford to relinquish the odious impost altogether. In its present partial state it would disgrace either Turkey or Russia, and never would have been sanctioned by a Parliament which legislated for any other interest than that of the aristocracy.

If the people will only be careful at the next Election to avoid candidates connected with the landed and funded interest, I think the nation may yet be saved from the horrors of a revolution.

I am with the greatest respect,

Sir, your most obedient servant,

A FRIEND TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

#### • PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT.

IN answer to the various inquiries, addressed to us respecting the transmission of Petitions, we beg to say that, by the Act 54 of George III., cap. 169, sec. 17, Petitions, addressed to either House of Parliament, may be received *free of postage* if sent *open* at the ends as a newspaper, not exceeding *six ounces* in weight, and addressed to a *Member*, with the words on the outside cover, "*Petition to Parliament.*" If written on paper, they will be *lighter* than on parchment, and equally *good*. When exceeding six ounces they should be sent, *carriage paid*, by coach; and addressed to the House of Lords or Commons, if the Members' residence is not known.

#### • TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The demands on our space still exceed our power of complying with them. The following communications of Correspondents will, however, we hope, appear in our Next.

"Evils of Intemperance, and Necessity of Legislative Measures for Correction."—Thomas Hartley.

"Desirability of Dispensing with the Services of Lawyers."—A Constant Reader.

"On the Injustice and Impolicy of Assessing Landlords of certain Houses to the Poor Rates."—A Reformer.

"Striking Illustrations of the Crying Necessity for an Immediate Church Reform."—Ralph Stevenson.

## THE BRITISH RIVER OF DEATH.

*(For The Parliamentary Review.)*

[It is stated in a late Publication on Temperance, that "The United Kingdom pays annually fifty millions pounds sterling for spirits, wine, and malt liquor; and consumes in the same period as much of these fiery liquids as would make a river of three feet deep, sixty feet wide, and eighty-four and a half miles long."]

Britons ! look on this stream,  
And read a nation's woe !  
What thousands madly dream,  
Where its foul waters flow !  
Disease and crime, and death abide,  
This river's all-polluting tide.

They tell of Java's tree—  
Of *Ætna's* fiery mount—  
Of Greenland's icy sea,  
Of *Lethe's* chilly fount:  
But this dark British river shews,  
A thousand, thousand, deeper woes !

Unlike the stream of life,  
That cheers yon blissful land ;  
Where no unholy strife  
Can raise the hateful brand,  
Is this wild flood whose waters roll  
To mar our peace, and blight our soul.

Britain ! do'st *thou* not see  
*Thy guilt and danger here ?*  
From this dread river flee,—  
It stops thy bright career—  
What thousands stray upon its banks !  
Of high-born and of humble ranks !

Say, ye that love your land,  
And wish her joys to flow,  
Will ye not firmly stand  
Against this wily foe ?  
That land for which a Sydney died,  
And Milton wrote,—his country's pride !

Shall not the orphan's wail—  
The widow's bitter tear—  
On England's friends prevail,  
And make them lend an ear ?  
To that great cause—the Temperance Cause—  
Approved by virtue's sacred laws ?

Oh ! when the battle's won,  
And Temperance shall abound  
And her celestial sun  
Shall gild our valley's round—  
The rose will then new fragrance shed  
The thistle proudly raise his head !

Then o'er Britannia's Isle,  
Through palace, hall, or cot ;  
Truth—freedom—peace—shall smile,  
Our woes shall be forgot—  
And He who doth the sparrows feed,  
Will shield us in the hour of need !

Glasgow, Feb. 26, 1834.

EDWARD MORRIS.

C. Whiting, Beaufort House, Strand.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1834.

---

PRESENT STATE AND CONDITION OF EUROPE.  
FOREIGN RELATIONS OF ENGLAND.

THE motion recently submitted by Mr. Shiel to the consideration of the House of Commons on the subject of our relations with Turkey and Russia seems to afford a fitting occasion for some observations on the present state and condition of Europe, and more particularly on the Foreign Relations of England. Postponing the remarks we intend to make on the recent motion (in which, as we observed, on the report of the debate, the Foreign Secretary as well as the Colonial Minister acquired no enviable distinction), till the concluding part of this article, we shall commence our observations with the more western part of Europe, and begin at once with that country in which civil war has been so long raging between the two brothers of the House of Braganza.

If an ancient Portuguese, of the time of John or Emanuel, were to rise from the tomb, he would no longer recognise as his country that glorious Portugal, which for a period of one hundred and twenty-four years was distinguished as the land of vast and successful projects, in which sovereigns and subjects shared a divided renown. The genius and daring of that epoch of wonder to the rest of Europe have departed for ever, and nothing now remains but the recollection of the discoverers of Africa, India, and the Brazils. But the names of Vasco di Gama, of Albuquerque, of Cabral, and Magellan, which cast a dishonouring shade on the modern Lusitanians, no longer invite their degenerate posterity to any rivalry, however feeble or distant.

Yet is the decadence of Portugal more owing to the governing than to the governed. The attempted extermination of the Moors—the religious persecution of the Jews, the establishment of the Inquisition—were measures which had the effect of driving away from the soil all industrious strangers, to render it tributary to an army of soldiers and monks. The victims of a gross and degrading superstition—divested of all their pristine energy—without industry—without activity—the Portuguese descended in the political scale, with a rapidity of which Europe presents few parallel instances. Barren in all else, modern Portugal was, nevertheless, rich in the great incumbrance of her

church. Though she had lost all earthly renown, she still retained the heavenly comfort of two Archbishoprics, thirteen Bishoprics, and four hundred Monasteries, filled with hosts of most relentless consumers. It was impossible for a country, only about one hundred leagues in length, and forty in breadth, and scarcely counting three millions of inhabitants, to maintain, at the same time, an army of soldiers and of priests. Portugal made her election between the two, and the result has been, that instead of recovering her pristine position, she has fallen under the misfortune of a disputed succession, and the misery of a sway demisacerdotal.

It is not our purpose—neither would it interest or instruct our readers—to go over the long contest between the respectable brothers, Miguel and Pedro. As to the legitimate right of the one or of the other, different persons may have different notions, but the question for our Government was not one of legitimacy at all. A Government *de facto* had been already established;—it had not only been established—but it had become permanent;—it not only had become permanent, but it appeared to contain within itself the seeds of stability;—and our duty in such a case was either not to interfere at all, or to acknowledge, as King *de facto*, the younger brother, Miguel, who had maintained himself on the throne despite the efforts of his external enemies; for internal enemies he appeared to have none. This latter course was the one adopted by the United States of America, and when we consider the important commercial interests involved in a recognition *de facto*, we confess we are surprised that the sagacity of the Duke of Wellington was so much at fault, as it appears to have been on this question. In 1815 the export of woollens alone to Portugal, amounted to 727,808*l.*, and when it is considered that English goods shipped to that country pay only 15 per cent. duty, while those of all other nations pay 30 per cent.—these alone afforded in our mind grounds sufficient, taken separately, for a *de facto* recognition.

We have said we do not mean to enter into the question of legitimacy, nor is it one in which our readers would take the least interest; but an hereditary right, as Blackstone well observes, by its means implies an indefeasible right to the throne. “It is unquestionably (says this authority), in the breast of the supreme legislature of the kingdom in certain cases to defeat this hereditary right.” Now the Portuguese themselves determined who was to be sovereign, though the three Estates did not declare that there was a defeasance of the right of succession; nor did they pretend that their act should be taken as a new limitation of the Crown, but as an interpretation and application of the existing law. Miguel sanctioned his assumption of the supreme power, by the recorded opinion of the most ancient assembly known to Portugal, and by an appeal to prejudices deeply rooted. We may lament the choice of the Portuguese, as much as possible, reasoning on English grounds; but still it might reasonably enough be assumed, that they were the best judges in a matter concerning their own internal Government. At the meeting of the three Estates, which declared that the Crown of Portugal devolved to Miguel, there were 30 Church Dignitaries, 121 Nobles, 153 Delegates, representing 84 cities and towns; in all 294 persons. Be it further remarked, that of the 84 Portuguese nobility, which prayed Don Miguel to take the Crown,

33 were Peers of Don Pedro's creation. Nor was his election confined only to the nobles; for, shortly after, the people rose tumultuously and proclaimed him King of an absolute Government.

We know, on the other hand, it may be, as it often has been alleged, that the interests of Public Liberty and Constitutional Government required the acknowledgment of Donna Maria. We are as sensible to the advantages of these blessings as any of our countrymen can possibly be; but we are still of opinion that the mere words alone have been made use of in this case to rally mankind about an individual who has just as little love for Public Liberty or Constitutional Government as Don Miguel himself. Looking to the past and present history and proceedings of Don Pedro (for it is idle to say that he does not govern, though his daughter may be the nominal sovereign), remembering his conduct to his father John VI.—his Government in the Brazils—and his late capricious and arbitrary proceedings in Portugal, we are clearly of opinion that Public Liberty, or Constitutional Government, will be as little forwarded by his pretended profession of principle, as that good Government would be maintained under the arbitrary and sacerdotal sway of his brother Miguel. It is for this reason we object to the prostitution of the words "Constitution" and "Liberty" to such vile uses.

It is not alone our Commerce which suffers by the prolongation of the civil contest in Portugal. We very much fear that the national character has suffered also. Never before in the History of England has the English soil been the theatre of a recruitment for a parcel of needy military adventurers, anxious only for pay and plunder, regardless of the cause or object in which they may be engaged. Formerly, such a reproach was confined to the mercenary Swiss *fantassin*, but now it attaches, we blush to say, to Britons. Let it not be said in mitigation that both parties have had fair play. That forms no excuse, for it is disgraceful for any civilized nation to furnish the aliment of civil war to two contending parties. The duties of a neutral should be confined to strict and rigid neutrality. Such a policy we could understand; but in England there is a pretended neutrality on the part of the Government, violated by the Cabinet in a direct countenance given to one contending party; and there is on the part of the people a regular traffic in flesh and blood, not determined by principle, but the more or less of pay which one party or another is enabled to give. It becomes the duty of the Government to adopt one of three courses—either to acknowledge the King *de facto*—to interfere openly in favour of Donna Maria—or to maintain the strictest neutrality in respect of both parties. Our present half measures have the effect of injuring our commercial interests—of depreciating the national character, and of needlessly prolonging a bloody and unprincipled civil war.

Many of the observations which we have made on the decline of Portugal, may with equal truth be applied to Spain. The causes of that decline are in both instances pretty similar:—the only difference is, that at one period, Spain attained to a higher degree of territorial extent and power than Portugal had ever done. Mistress of Portugal herself, and of all her colonies—Spain was but the centre of a system, which on either side touched the extremities of the world; and there



certainly was more of truth than of exaggeration in the remark, "that the sun never set on the dominions of Philip." But Philip, instead of nobly employing the treasures of Peru and Mexico, wasted them in objects of criminal ambition and ferocious persecution; and this gloomy sovereign of so many states, left only to his successors a fatal legacy of debts and discontents. Under him, the royal authority became based on a superstructure of priests—under him the violence of the Inquisition was aided by the power of the despot; and Spain, by the effects of such a sway, fell from a state of industry and activity to one of silent and melancholy superstition. The Spanish soldier, who, a century before had been the bravest warrior in Europe, now lost his character; and military ardour declined as priestly influence ruled the ascendant. This was but natural. Encourage military enterprises and you will have a people of soldiers;—subsidise the Church, and you will have only an army of priests.

Since the reign of Philip there has been one bright and glorious period in the annals of Spain; but that too has passed, and for ever. The Spain of 1834 is not widely different from the Spain of 1555. Out of a population of 11 millions, 190,000 still belong to the Church, and wallow in overabundant wealth; while the mass of the nation is steeped in the deepest poverty. A fatal apathy seems to have seized on all ranks. Insensible to the suggestions of national glory, or hardy enterprise, the Spaniard of the present day reserves his collected enthusiasm, for the observances of a puerile and spurious devotion—for the deadly liveliness of the *tertulia*, or the sanguinary pleasure of the *bull-fight*. Yet, although Spain has irrevocably lost her American colonies, her sons should reflect on those times, when she possessed nought beyond the limits of her own soil. She was then rich, powerful, and respected. Her troops, the terror of all Europe, had spread their renown far and near; the nation was happy, and a considerable population, without impoverishing its native resources, furnished subsistence to her victorious armies. Though Spain has lost the Indies, she still possesses these elements of her former greatness; treasures more precious than the mines of Mexico and Peru. Her soil still produces corn, wine, silk, wool, and fruit, in variety and abundance. Within her boundary are found mines of lead and iron, and she has a sea-coast, inferior to none in the world. Yet, with all these advantages, Spain has been fast falling to certain ruin. At present she is in the throes of a civil war; and England has already thrown her weight into the scale, in behalf of her young queen.

A question arises whether any change of dynasty can improve the condition of Spain? We are among the number of those who think not. Unless the system in which Spain has been administered, be entirely changed and remodelled, we confess we do not indulge in much hope for that wretched country. The misgovernment of so many centuries is not to be corrected by the substitution of one royal personage for another. Unless the whole social state of Spain be changed—unless the privileges of the Church and the *Mesta* be abolished, it is very indifferent whether Spain be governed by Carlists or Christinos.

Of the new premier of Spain we wish to say nothing disparaging as a *littérateur*. He is a man of considerable talent, much fancy, and some eloquence; but it is one thing to be a successful dramatist and

novel writer, and another to be a great statesman. In this crisis of her history, Spain requires a Cromwell or a Napoleon, and not a mere *phraseur*. Martinez de la Rosa is undoubtedly a person of good intentions; but his will is weak and flexible, and he is entirely governed by his colleague, Garelli, the Minister of Grace and Justice, who, however celebrated as an advocate at Granada, has yet to make a character as an able and honest minister. We much doubt that the present Spanish ministry have the nerve, even supposing them to possess the desire to strike at the fundamental abuses which gnaw into the very vitals of the Peninsula. Though Zea be no longer in power, his influence and his principles still govern the councils of the Escurial, and a perseverance in his system will infallibly produce either a revolution or the ultimate success of Don Carlos.

If the question in Spain were one merely of persons, the success of Don Carlos were greatly to be desired. Though divested of the first of male virtues—courage, he is in other respects a humane and good man, and was, when we were at Madrid, greatly popular with the people; while the young queen, on the other hand, is tainted with the worst vices of the Neapolitan Bourbons. Weak, fickle, ignorant, inconstant, and ungrateful, she too nearly resembles in other respects that infamous Caroline of Naples, whose blood runs in her veins—or the mother of her deceased husband, who sacrificed the interest of her country, and the honour of her king and husband, to a worthless favourite. In a word, Maria Christina is disfigured by the vices of the Messalina of the North, without possessing any portion of her imperial talents. Without alluding more particularly to her gallantries, we may with truth say that the epitaph written by Tick on a too liberal German lady, may be justly engraven on the tomb of the young and widowed Queen of Spain.

“As Titus thought, so thought the fair deceased,  
And daily made one happy man at least.”

Under such a sovereign we do not think the Spaniards have much to hope. She may call the Cortes *por Estamentos*, but Don Carlos, with all his bigotry would do as much, while he would govern the kingdom untrammelled by the system of the *Juste Milieu*, a system whose authors are seeking to commit as great a fraud on the Spanish people as they have already succeeded in committing on the people of France. It may, no doubt, be replied to us, that Don Carlos would govern in the interest of priests and monks. We are by no means sure of this; at all events we are quite certain that this influence would not be so manifest or sensible as people in England imagine; but even supposing it to prevail, it is a lesser evil than the predominance of that swindling and fraudulent diplomacy, the emanation of the pure breast of that “best of Republics,” King Louis-Philippe.

England is well represented at the court of Spain, during this crisis. We feel confident that Mr. Villiers will advise the young queen with all frankness and sincerity, and not be diverted from his purpose by the *tracasserie* of M. Oubril, who has been long enough in Spain to acquire a knowledge of her public men, and who is moreover furnished by his government with ample pecuniary means to forward Russian interests.—Nor will the British Ambassador, we trust, allow himself to be circumvented by the practised finesse, or overborne by the anti-

English antipathies of M. De Rayneval, the confidential friend of the Monarch of the Barricades. The destinies of Spain are in the hands of the Great Disposer of Events, but at present her political position is environed with difficulties, and she is like Portugal torn by civil war. It were to be wished that some bold and resolute hand would minister to her disease ere it be too late.

Italy, heretofore the centre of the universe, the mistress and queen of nations, is now only remarkable for the remains of her bygone magnificence and power. Divided and broken as modern Italy is, a revolution if successful, could be but local, and unless protected by foreign powers, could never be permanent. A union of her provinces would build a wall of brass around her frontier. Two fair occasions presented themselves for this glorious design, but these are now gone for ever by. The first was when the fabric of Napoleon's power fell to pieces. Had Eugene Beauharnais been then guilty of one of those splendid crimes which are generally justified by the success that attends them—had he listened to the proposals of Murat,\* and raised his standard in Lombardy, all Italy might have gathered beneath it.—And had Murat himself, instead of losing time in attempting to possess himself of the batteries of the Po, marched into Piedmont, he might have been enabled to make a desperate effort for the independence of Italy. But the last stake was won by the allies, and Italy was cut up and parcelled into fragments, in defiance of political and geographical relations. Pontecorvo and Benevento, completely surrounded by the Neapolitan territory were given to the Pope. Guastalla was politically united to Parma, though geographically separated from it by the Modenese territory. An inhabitant of Guastalla, going a distance of eighteen miles to the capital of his state, is obliged to be provided with a foreign passport, and it most frequently happens that the document is *viséd* half a dozen, and his luggage visited half a score of times before he reaches his destination. But the wisdom of the Treaty of Vienna does not end here. The transit of goods is as much fettered as the movements of travellers. A piece of cloth of Milan fabric is considered as much foreign at Rome, as though it were made at Leeds; and should the padrone of a wine-shop at Milan wish to have a hogshhead of wine from Modena, he is obliged to pay as heavy a duty as though he imported it from Portugal or France.

It must be confessed that the scheme is diabolically consistent, for the Archduke Reigier, the Viceroy of Milan, will not allow his people of Lombardy to send a grain of corn to the Tuscan subjects of his brother the Grand Duke. Though the freedom of rivers was guaranteed at a congress displaying these memorable instances of fiscal wisdom, yet a boat descending the Po from Ferrara to Placentia, has to pay duties, first to his Holiness the Pope, and then in succession to Austria, Parma, and the Duke of Modena. It may be said that the French were cruel task-masters in Italy, but the monstrous folly of these cordons of custom-houses did not exist during the sway of Napoleon. The institution of custom-houses at the interval of a few miles between Padua and Venice, and Vicenza and Padua, all within the same state,

\* Vide Botte's History of Italy, under Napoleon, vol. ii. p. 381.

was a discovery reserved for the Imperial House of Vienna, whose crest is emblematic of this voracity to devour the substance of its subjects :

“ Aquila Giffagna  
Che due becchi porta per melgio dievorar.”

At present the taxes in Austrian Italy amount to 37 per cent. In the time of the French domination they amounted to 42 or 44. But there was a redeeming virtue in Gallic impositions, however heavy. The taxes then raised on the Italian soil were expended in the completion of magnificent public works—in the foundation of establishments for the encouragement of art—in fine public roads—and a secure police. Under Napoleon native talent was encouraged, protected, and promoted. There was not a Frenchman employed even as a sub-prefect in Italy, and the country enjoyed the incalculable advantages of a Code which allowed the cross-examination of witnesses, and which gave publicity to the proceedings of justice. Now, however, all this is changed. Native Italians are discouraged and proscribed—the roads are allowed to fall out of repair—the revenue of the country is spent at Vienna, and Austrian soldiers are supplied with all necessaries of clothing, &c., out of her hereditary transalpine dominions. What a contrast to the policy of Napoleon! Under him the Italian soldier was fed and clothed with the products of the Peninsula; now he wears the broad cloth of Moravia and Bohemia, and eats the black bread of Styria and Carinthia. Under Napoleon the mouied proprietor was made to contribute to the exigencies of the country; now he is like the fundholder in England, untouched altogether by direct and little touched by indirect taxation. Can this system last? Surely no. It hangs by the life of one man; and were the Emperor Francis dead to-morrow it is almost certain that the whole system would fall to pieces. Who can read the deeply interesting memoirs of Silvio Pellico without fervently praying for a consummation so devoutly to be wished for, in the interests of Italy and of Europe? All the petty states of Italy are administered on a bad model. They have preserved whatever was rapacious in the system of Napoleon, and all that was most odious and contemptible in the older but not yet exploded system.

After the Lombardo-Venetian kingdoms (the most considerable as the appendages of a vast monarchy) the kingdom of Naples claims our notice. No country has oftener changed its masters than the two Sicilies. These repeated mutations have singularly weakened the national spirit. A Neapolitan loves his country, no doubt, but he loves it as the “cloudless clime” whose sunny skies minister to his mere animal gratification. His is not the patriotism of an ancient inhabitant of the eternal city, who looked on his country as the *maxima rerum Roma*. In the Neapolitan sentiment of country there is neither depth, nor intensity, nor principle:—it is not a love which lives on painful sacrifices—or tempts its victim to bold and daring enterprises of national amelioration. The population of the kingdom of the two Sicilies is fully equal to that of Ireland: it is considerably greater than that of Prussia under the great Frederick; and double that which Sweden counted under Gustavus Adolphus. But these sovereigns injured their subjects to the toils and dangers of war, and achieved great things with a disciplined army. In Naples the Church

militant is more favoured than the national defenders. While the army amounts to 24,000 troops, the clergy forms a broad batalion of 200,000. Ecclesiastical corporatfons possess the half of the landed property of the state, "devouring the houses" of the widow and the orphan. No doubt some improvements have taken place under the young monarch who now fills the throne, but much, very much, yet remains to be done. The abolition of feudal tenures—the institution of asylums for the poor—the repression of mendicancy and brigandage—the suppression of thousands of religious houses destined to the use of either sex—are measures called for imperiously in the interests of the people at large.

The contrast between Tuscany and the Roman states is striking in the extreme. In the former all is activity, industry, and comparative wealth; in the latter all is poverty, idleness, superstition, malversation, and misgovernment. Men and animals—the human species as well as the brute creation—seem to wither and decay under the blighting influence of the Papal power. Sovereigns without posterity rarely become the testators of a people which they cannot call their own. Cut off from the endearing ties which unite the rest of mankind to society—with no human interests to serve—destitute alike of human sympathies and human passions—is it wonderful that the head of the Church—too often an ignorant, narrow-minded, and bigoted monk, should be among the worst of European sovereigns? Though the Inquisition does not prevail at Rome—and though strangers of all countries can dwell in peace and safety within the "Eternal City," yet is the sovereign a hard task-master to his wretched subjects. Under a Theocratic Government all places of honour and power are given to Priests, and it were superfluous now to say that the brethren of Melchisedec have been from all time accounted the most exacting masters. In the Roman states, however, they are not only exacting, but absolutely dishonest. It is not very long since the Cardinal Legate of Bologna made 50,000 francs by exporting grain at a time when this privilege was forbidden to the rest of the community. Taxation is here unequal and unjust. A government administered by Priests will subserve priestly interests at the expense of the rest of the community. The Cardinal's purple-painted coach goes untaxed, while the rubbia of corn, which makes the hard-earned bread of the indigent, pays a duty of 20 pauls at the mill. The very name of Roman is now disgraceful to the people, for it suggests comparison with what Roman *was* in the olden time. The Papal Government is despised and bearded even to the *Potor del Popolo*. A few ill paid Sbirri are unable to control the miscreants which infect the Campagna, much less to quell the insurrections of the Legations. Meanwhile the French and Austrians keep the Pope's peace, while his Holiness mortgages the *prediale* and *sopra imposte* to a Jew banker. Can this system last long? Surely the Roman States, with the Legations, must soon be swallowed up either by Austria or some other first-rate power, in the first war or revolution which takes place, unless the sanguine reveries of those who dream of the unity of Italy shall be accomplished. English diplomacy played an unwontedly worthy part in the affairs of 1832. The note of Mr. Seymour, our then and present Minister at Tuscany, was worthy of the country which he so ably represented.

Of Tuscany itself we have little to say except in praise. It has been well-governed since the time of Leopold; but then Ricci achieved half the good by dealing with religious houses as another religious man—Cromwell—dealt with the Long Parliament—namely, turning the rogues into the street, shutting the door, and putting the key into the pocket of the right royal Commonwealth. Tuscany is in truth the garden of the fair land of which we have been speaking. The secret of its prosperity may be discovered in the generally equal division of property. Of late we believe the court of Vienna has greatly sought to interfere with the volition of the Grand Duke; but we hope unsuccessfully. Fossambroni still lives, and, unless he be sadly altered, these attempts would be repudiated by that able and virtuous minister.

Sardinia and Piedmont form the most warlike part of Italy. Here discontent is not dead but only sleepeth. Here, too, the Austrian “hand of lead with silken glove” has lately been too apparent. It is a magic hand, no doubt, for it has changed the Carbonaro Carignan into the despotic sovereign of Savoy. The ex-prince and actual sovereign served under the Duke of Angouleme at the taking of the *Trocadero*, yet where is the Duke of Angouleme now, and what brought him to Prague? Are examples always to be lost on royal houses, and must the descendant of Victor Emanuel form one royal exile more to save his people and instruct the race of kings? Though the late mad attempt of General Romarino on Savoy has failed signally, yet there is a limit at which Piedmontese forbearance must stop. When Francis of Austria is gathered to his fathers, the King of Hungary, his first-born, and heir-apparent, may have too much to do in Pest and Prague to be able to aid his brother across the Alps.

An English diplomatic agent has now little to do at Turin, but at all events it is more than questionable that Sir Augustus Foster is the most fitting person to serve a Whig and Reforming Government. We now take our leave of Italy. Even after the rapid and hasty glance we have taken, the most careless observer cannot but remark that this people, full of native genius and great aspirations, but bide the propitious moment to cast off the yoke which oppresses them.

If there be a people in Europe deserving of freedom, and qualified to enjoy it, it is the Germans. The singleness of their hearts—the kindness of their manners—the softness and, at the same time, the steadiness and stability of their dispositions—their freedom from the passion for political intrigue, and military glory, which disfigures the French, and from the finesse which distinguishes the Russian, the Greek, and, too often, the Italian—the extent and variety of their information—their candour—and the whole train of peaceful virtues with which they are so richly endowed—peculiarly qualify them for appreciating and enjoying the highest degree of political liberty. Add to this that Representative Government has been in Germany of ancient date. States had been in use from the earliest times in which the chiefs of the villages had a right to a seat and a vote. At one period these States or Parliaments were universal and powerful, and though generally they have been shorn of their fairest proportions, still it was only in Prussia and Oldenburg they had grown into absolute disuse.\* Representative Governments are therefore of old duration

---

\* Vide Spittler Geschichte des Fürstenthums Hanover.

among our German brethren ; but unfortunately, such is the credulity and passiveness of this honest and simple people, that they have not perceived that in a principal instance the advantages of Representative Governments have been denied them, while their pride has been flattered with the name and shadow of them. To call the States of Hanover (a Chamber a majority of whose members is nominated by the Crown) a true representation of the people, would be a gross misnomer. The name it bears in the country corresponds to its character. It is called the *Jahen Gesellschaft*—the Assenting Society. Such an institution is framed rather to support the interests of the nobles and the sovereign than to add to the power of the people. Of late, however, much has been achieved in Hanover by the attempt to publish the debates in the States, which has been partially carried into effect. The besetting sin of Hanover is the monopolizing and exclusive spirit which vests office solely in the Aristocracy. There are separate benches in the courts of justice for the nobles, and these marked distinctions between noble and humble born distinctively and disadvantageously mark the University of Gottingen. We do not anticipate that any strenuous much less violent efforts will be made by the Hanoverians to improve their condition. To love their prince is with them a principle of their existence. We wish, however, they would look more to the Estates. There is much room for improvement, and only one thing worthy of the imitation of the English Parliament. When a Member wearies the House, the Speaker always reminds him *dass er sich kurz fasse* ; literally, that he should make himself short.

The Government of Prussia—whether its character be despotical or democratic—is certainly the best administered in Europe. The measure carried by Hardenburgh in 1810, erecting the peasantry into free proprietors, introduced a new order into the social and landed system of Prussia ; nor were the abolition of numerous custom houses, and the publicity introduced into the public expenditure, less important reforms. But the crowning measures of all were the secularization and sale of the Church lands, the destruction of the Corporation and Trades monopolies, the institution of a national system of Education, and the new organization in 1827 of the Saxon provinces. For a considerable period the subjects of Prussia have been rising in wealth, respectability, and importance, and we consider it a great mistake to suppose that French principles—or a passion for French masters prevails on the Prussian banks of the Rhine. On the contrary, we think Frederick-William just as popular there as at Berlin or Potsdam, and we are quite convinced that the new commercial system will render the Rhenane subjects more deeply, because more personally, interested in the prosperity and permanency of the system pursued by the cabinet of Berlin.

It has been often said by the Prussian nobility, that the measures of Stein and Hardenburgh were Jacobinical and revolutionary ; but we conceive the commercial revolution which Prussia is now and has for the last ten years been labouring to bring about, with equal dexterity and zeal, to be a league or confederation which will ultimately have the effect of giving to this new monarchy an influence quite preponderant in the Confederation. Nor will this be alone a commercial influence ; for the sharp-sighted and able Ministers of Prussia will not

limit their efforts to the advancement of their own manufacturing industry, but they will attempt to turn their commercial supremacy to purposes of political and territorial aggrandisement. So long as the present king lives this system may go on slowly and surely to its end, but if the Crown Prince were to ascend the throne to-morrow, and attempted to disturb the repose of Europe, it would be difficult to calculate to what extent this commercial league, including Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, Hesse Darmstadt, Hesse Cassell, and Saxe-Weimar, might be influenced by common military and fiscal interests. And when it is remembered that by means of Baden and Neuchâtel Prussia may ultimately influence all Switzerland to join her in this system, there is no saying what effect such a united confederacy, extending from Silesia to Geneva, and from Munich to Friburgh and the Grisons, may have on the commercial and military position of Europe. Already have lures been thrown out by Prussia to Belgium on this subject; and again, in the event of a war, may England see a completer and better-organised Continental system directed against her manufacturing supremacy than ever existed in the time of Napoleon. The internal operation of this system in Germany is equally worthy of remark. It is a grand blow levelled at the free cities of Frankfort, Bremen, and Hamburg—the great *entrepôts* of English commerce and contraband, and a lessening, *pro tanto*, of the influence of the smaller and poorer German states. It is not to England alone that this system is menacing. It is equally directed against the trade and power of France; and if no strong united reclamations have been made on the subject by the English and French Governments—if, on the contrary, these Governments, instead of forming a counter-league, are squabbling daily on matters involving only a few sous on the duty on coal, we confess we do not see the advantage—on the contrary we see only the delusion—of the so-called French and English alliance.

It cannot be doubted that Prussia expects large results from a scheme at which she has laboured (under trying discouragements) with such uniform and untiring perseverance. Already does she await the lion's share of the carrying trade so long monopolised by Holland, and by means of Pillau, Königsberg, Stettin, and Dantzic, (formerly a free town under the protection of England, but robbed from Poland, by Frederick, at the first partition of that unhappy kingdom), she will first rival, and ultimately ruin Hamburg, Bremen, Kiel, Rostock, and Groningen, and, unless unchecked, exclude English products from all parts of Germany. The evil will not rest here. Having the materials for a ship's wear and tear at much less cost than Britain, and finding sailors ready made at Mecklenburgh and Altona, she will navigate the German Ocean, the Baltic, and the Cattegat, at one-third of the expense of British ships—thus throwing our shipowners and naval population into still deeper distress.

It may be enquired, what our Foreign Minister is doing all this while? No doubt forming a counterleague with Sweden,\* Denmark, and Meck-

\* Sleswick and Holstein, the Continental and German dominions of the King of Denmark, comprehending Lauenburgh, which was separated from Hanover by the Treaty of Vienna, are a much larger part of the kingdom than the Islands, and in an agricultural point of view, the most important possessions of the Crown. The inhabitants are all of the original Saxon race, and would gladly take our manufactures



lenburgh. Alas! for poor Lord Palmerston! He knows, we suppose, little more about the effect of what we have been speaking of than his Majesty's Representative at Berlin.—Why Lord Minto was sent to Prussia at such a crisis, let the “weird sisters” divine, for verily it is above all human understanding. The noble member for the county of Hants may vaunt as much as he pleases about his treaty with the free town, Franckfort (the ratification of which was changed in the summer of 1832); but we tell him that this treaty is now neither more nor less than a sheet of waste paper.

The matter grows under our hand to a greater length than we had anticipated. But we arrest our pen at the present point; and will resume the subject in our next.

---

#### USEFUL DEFINITIONS.

In the production of wealth, the agency of the inferior animals, the agency of machines, and the agency of the powers of nature, are frequently employed to produce effects similar to those, which are produced by human agency. But it is not, therefore, correct to speak, as some economical writers do\*, of the labour of cattle, the labour of machines, and the labour of nature. In the language of Political Economy, every thing should be precise and definite; and our terms, instead of being *generalized*, so as to confound distinctions, should be *particularized*, so as to mark the shades of difference between analogous subjects—and to place them before us separate, and, as it were, at a distance from each other. Instead of applying the same common term to the several agencies of men, of cattle, of machines, and of nature—we should say the *labour* of men, the *work* of cattle, the *action* of machines, and the *operations* of nature.—*Robert Torrens*.

#### FARMING LABOURERS.

ONE of the evils springing from the poor-laws is the obstructions which they present to the free circulation of labour, and the local superabundance of labouring population, which they occasionally appear to exhibit, has probably given rise to, and certainly countenances, the prevailing opinion that the aggregate labouring population is in excess. It was supposed to be so in Lenham, until, through an arrangement, all the labourers were taken by the farmers, and then they discovered that there were not more than were requisite in *fair* farming! The strangest thing is, that they should ever have been, by people capable of reflection, thought too numerous. These 203 labourers, besides furnishing to the farmers the ordinary returns for their employed capital, and keeping up the necessary stock of cattle, implements, and seed, raise from the land produce which yields to the land and tithe owners 7,000*l.*, while they have only 6,000*l.* for themselves; and yet these highly productive people were thought too numerous! Why, each labourer consumed only a small part of what he produced, and yet emigration to a foreign country was looked to as a remedy! Suppose 53 of the Lenham labourers had emigrated, would the remaining 150 have been able to raise produce enough to keep up the stock, remunerate the farmer for the use of his capital, furnish the 7,000*l.* of rent and tithe, and create for themselves additional wages? Or might not the fund left for the wages, instead of being increased, be reduced in a greater degree than the labouring population had been reduced? The sum of 4,500*l.* would yield about the same wages to the 150 which 6,000*l.* did to the 203, but might not the sum be reduced to 4,000*l.* or to 3,000*l.*? And then would not the farmers and overseers find it still more difficult to provide for the 150 than it was for the 203? Another emigration would then become equally or rather more necessary, which would lead to a third!—*Hopkins' Great Britain for the last Forty Years*.

---

\* M'Culloch.

## POPULAR EDUCATION IN FRANCE, AND PROSPECTS OF ITS EXTENSION IN ENGLAND.

[The intelligent and benevolent writer of the following article is no more. He has paid the debt of nature since we received this contribution from his hands: and as we know that the closing prayer of his life was in perfect accordance with all his active pursuits during his existence—which were incessantly directed to promote the welfare of his country, and the happiness of mankind, we now feel that we shall but fulfil the wishes of his departed spirit, by extending the benefit of his information and his opinions as widely as our pages can diffuse them.]

THE following observations on Popular Education, selected and arranged from the Common Place-Book of an Invalid just returned from a seven months' residence in France, are published thus separately and hastily on account of their peculiar interest at the present time in this country; where, although useful knowledge has of late years been extensively diffused by the exertions of individuals, no recognized system of National Education has been yet adopted.

In fact, clogged with a House of Commons, that might much more appropriately have been called by another name, Government has in consequence, for a long time past, been carried on more for the benefit of a comparatively few individuals of the community, than for the general good. So that no greater attention to the wants and interests of the great body of the people than was necessary to conceal, or gloss over the deformity of the system, could reasonably be expected. The day of this delusion is, however, past; the PEOPLE begin to see with their own eyes, and to hear with their own ears, and that they should not only on this, but on every subject which concerns their own happiness and the prosperity of the nation, (which are inseparably united) rightly understand, and judge of, what they see and hear,—it is a matter of the highest importance, that a system of Education for *all*, freed from party and narrow views, should speedily be adopted.

From an administration mainly composed of avowed friends to the extensive diffusion of useful knowledge, but above all from that distinguished individual whose continued and consistent advocacy of the cause of Education will do more to render the name of BROUGHAM illustrious than all that wealth and power can effect, may not this greatest of national blessings be confidently expected when the auguean stable of corruption shall have been cleansed, and the way cleared for measures of public good? Still, the active support of public opinion, firmly and temperately expressed, will be necessary to complete and final success, even when the Reform Bill of Rights shall have become law; for it is too evident that the ignorance of the real state and interests of the country, the antiquated and absurd prejudices, and the disgraceful selfishness which brought the late House of Commons to its premature end, are not extinct.

If, as is hoped, the publication of the following facts and observations should excite renewed and increased attention to the great object of general Education in this country; or, if in any manner these facts and observations should promote its success, the Author will be amply consoled for having consented to detach them from other subjects of high interest connected with the present state and circumstances of a people and country, seemingly destined by Providence to influence in no slight degree the future fortunes and happiness of Europe and of the world.

No country has suffered more than France for want of a general and good system of popular Education; no one has benefited more by the share of it, it has been permitted to enjoy, and to no one whatever is its universality of more importance; whilst in a more extended point of view, it may be truly said, that to the whole of civilized Europe, the speedy diffusion of that useful, practical knowledge in France, which may be properly, though perhaps not commonly called *Education*, is a matter of the highest interest.

The system of universal Education, which its ardent and enlightened friends in France hope to see adopted in that country as a measure of government, after it is purged of the abominations and perversions which have been insidiously introduced into it, will do more to establish the salutary restraints of reason and prudence in the ordinary concerns of life, to elevate and refine the character, to perpetuate an enlightened system of political liberty, and to *ensure the peace and happiness of the world*,\* than perhaps many, even of its warmest advocates, at present contemplate. And thus at length will be discovered that philosopher's stone of certain political economists, which has been sought for in vain amidst the rubbish of baser materials. It has been well and wisely remarked, that "Political Education is like the keystone of the arch, the strength of the whole depends upon it, as the strength of domestic and technical Education depends almost entirely on the social:" and it is no less certain, and cannot be controverted, "that the nature of the social Education depends almost entirely upon the political; and the most important *part of the physical* (that which operates with the greatest force upon the greatest number, the state of aliment and labour of the lower classes,) is in the long run determined by the action of the political machine. *The play therefore of the political machine acts immediately upon the mind, and with extraordinary power; but this is not all; it also acts upon almost every thing else by which the character of the mind is apt to be formed.*"† It follows then, that it is of vital importance to the best interests of humanity, and of France in particular, that the exertions of the friends to universal and unrestricted Education in that country, should be attended with complete success:—in the first place, effectually to purify the present establishments of those mystifying and debasing corruptions, which artful individuals, finding that something in the name of education must be continued to the people, have so zealously striven to incorporate in the popular systems of teaching; and in the next place, that those national

\* This may be thought by some to be too enlarged a view of the subject; but let such persons consider what the influence of the example of France has done—and how much more must it do?

† Supplement to Ency. Brit. art. Education.

establishments, with all the improvements and adaptations to the wants, interests, and progress of society of which they are capable, should be reconstructed on a more enlightened, solid, and comprehensive basis.

Up to the period of the Revolution of 1789, Education in France was conducted in schools, colleges, and other ancient establishments, at the head of which ranked the University of Paris. Boarding schools, such as we have in England, there were but few of, as the colleges enjoyed a sort of monopoly in some branches of teaching; and female education, which was confined nearly to outward accomplishments, was carried on chiefly in convents. The funds previously appropriated to the purposes of Education, such as it was, in schools, colleges, and other foundations, were involved in the fate of the church revenues at the time of the Revolution; but the new government pledged itself to the people to establish a National Education on an improved footing. It was of peculiar importance to the new order of things, that the education of the youth of the country should not remain in the hands of persons well known to be generally adverse to the political changes which had taken place; but, attacked from without by the combination of European despots, and threatened from within by a party ever on the watch to seize any favourable opportunity of restoring the reign of feudal, clerical, and regal oppression, the execution of this object, essentially necessary as it was, was delayed until the year 1796, when an act of the legislature was passed, which, along with many other provisions, directed that schools, both primary and central, should be established throughout the country. Unfortunately, new troubles intervened, and the plan was never thoroughly carried into execution, particularly in regard to the primary or elementary schools. Hence the very defective education of the youth of the lower orders, in the interval between the loss of the original funds and the establishment of schools on the new plan.

Bonaparte, who after a certain period of his life, valued nothing but as it might be made to administer to his power and ambition, converted the means of education into an engine of state, and placed the establishment for that purpose throughout the empire under the controul of "le Grand Maître et Conseil de l'Université de Paris," who delegated this important trust to a board called Commission d'Instruction Publique. This board was maintained by the Bourbons, and fearing that under the circumstances of the times, there was no other way of keeping the education of the youth of France out of the hands of the clergy, the opposition party in the Chambers acquiesced therein, as the least of two evils, notwithstanding their well founded repugnance to such a measure. It was very clearly discernible, however, throughout the reign of Louis XVIII., that there existed an intention in the government to curtail rather than extend the benefits of education, so far as might be practicable without exciting too great a share of public indignation; and accordingly it is computed that, whether in town or country, not one half of the number of the lower classes were even taught to read. The neglect was repeatedly noticed in the legislature, and particularly as early as in February, 1816, but although Rectors of Universities were then authorized to grant certificates of capacity as teachers, and a metropolitan school was established for the purpose of qualifying them, the ministers of the crown took effectual care, under

one pretext or other, to withhold the necessary salaries, and the aid afforded by the magistrates of communes seldom extend farther than the finding a school-room, and perhaps a dwelling for the teacher. In this state of things the friends of Education in France had recourse to schools, supported at first by private subscription, grounded on the Lancasterian plan, before introduced under the name of Ecoles d'enseignement mutuel, which have proved of admirable service.\* These schools have been in many instances adopted and assisted by the inhabitants and magistrates of districts—although the persons presumptuously assuming to themselves the appellation of “Freres de la doctrine Chretienne,” supported by the great body of the clergy, and, during the reign of Louis XVIII. covertly, but in the time of the ex-king, openly, patronised and espoused by the court, used every means of opposing and counteracting them within their power. In the course of a few years eight hundred schools of mutual instruction were established, which number is now so greatly increased, that those, and the primary schools, together, in the year 1826, amounted to no less than 24,378;† whilst up to the decease of Louis XVIII. those of the “Freres de la doctrine Chretienne” amounted only to 150. The avowed patronage of Charles X. and the restless activity of the Jesuits, multiplied the self-called Christian schools, and proportionably repressed the still growing increase of the others. Not satisfied with the open and avowed sanction of the king and his confessor, “the Christian Brethren” every where presented alternately, the hope of reward on the one hand, and muttered imprecations and threats on the other; taking the most unjustifiable means of compelling the attendance of the children—often, and particularly in country places, visiting mothers in the absence of their husbands, persuading the weak, and frightening the superstitious, into sending their children to the schools.† All the influence and authority which the “Freres de la doctrine Chretienne” could exercise, in many cases failed however to ensure the regular attendance of their scholars; and the disgust of the latter at the discipline and doctrines, as well as their contempt for the persons of their teachers, were characteristically manifested on many occasions. Nor was the utter dislike of an immense majority of the male part of the adult population less vehement than that of the youth, nor their determination to render Education free and universal, less strong, though manifested in a different manner, as soon as the restraint imposed upon them, by the destruction of the bigot government, was withdrawn.

Amongst the pinching questions put to the Minister, Casimir Périer, by his constituents of Troyes, previous to election, one was, whether he “*would vote AGAINST the establishment of Universal Education, and FOR the maintenance of the University Monopoly?*” The counsel general of the department of Loire et Cher, whilst they rejected the proposition of the Préfet to allow 3000 francs to the bishop, freely granted that sum to the school, besides voting 2000 francs towards the establishment of new primary schools. In the same spirit, during the

---

\* M. Dupin.

† This was one of the artifices practised on the superior classes, by which the Jesuits increased their power and influence in France, at a former period.—See M. Taberaud's Essay on the Jesuits, 2d Edit. p. 283.

Session of the Council of the Arrondissement of Marseilles, the suppression of the bishopric and chapter, at the death of the present bishop, was voted, and the extension of primary instruction decreed. Thus, whilst the Bigoted ecclesiastics which Charles X. unfortunately left behind him, with the Archbishop of Paris at their head, still continue to insult public opinion, and to provoke its vengeance, the people everywhere manifest the most determined resolution to curb their power, and to counteract their known hostility to the spread of useful knowledge.

But though the establishment of primary schools went on slowly, and has been constantly frowned on, as well during as since the time of Bonaparte, (he and his successors being alike jealous of the spread of knowledge among the people, and all for the same reason—because “their deeds were evil,”) the great schools for the education of the sons of the middle and upper classes experienced a very different fate. Bonaparte flattered himself, that knowledge under his own immediate direction and controul might be made subservient to his views, without running the risk with which the universal extension of Education would be accompanied. He well knew the value of knowledge, but he wished to monopolize its advantages to himself. Thus the Lycées were objects of his care, both as a nursery for officers, and as a means of interesting the parents in his government. With that view he established a number of bourses or scholarships, and put the discipline of the whole under the direction of the Commission d’Instruction Publique, at Paris. In these, since called Collèges Royaux, originated the Polytechnic School, the students of which acquired such immortal honour in the days of July, 1830: it was established for the purpose of teaching young men the mathematics, and drawing for the Engineer Corps; none but candidates of talent are admitted; and it is well entitled to the name of a nursery (pepenière) of intelligent officers. It has been calculated, that the students of the Polytechnic School, together with those of medicine, the law, &c. amount, in Paris alone, to five or six thousand; a number sufficient, with the very superior attainments in knowledge they possess, and their known political sentiments, to exercise a very influential part in society.\*

The schools for mutual instruction in Paris appear also to be very well conducted. Without meaning to depreciate the others, or to suggest that they are at all inferior, the one established in the *Marché des Innocents* does the highest credit to all concerned in it. The system of mutual instruction on which this school is based, resembles that of all the others of the same name, and was borrowed originally from the plan of the Lancasterian, or British School Society. Englishmen will smile, and some of them perhaps laugh outright, at the idea of teaching these boys music; and yet true it is, vocal music is one of the branches of their study, and its effect in breaking in the rude, subduing the boisterous, and civilizing the whole, was described as wonderful. Their friends take care to supply their dinners at the school, and the boys ate them with no little glee and relish in a room adjoining. As is their constant custom, they sung themselves out of

---

\* The average number of the students in the Polytechnic School, for 13 years previous to 1826, was, according to M. Dupin, 1933.

the school into their dining-room, at a well-known signal, marching in classes and by files as regularly as drilled soldiers. When the last class had arrived, the singing instantly ceased, and the work of mastication seriously commenced, in which they showed themselves as expert as in their school exercises. It is to be hoped and expected, that the youth of both sexes will in the future schools be trained to some useful employ; the former be taught the use of the hammer and the spade as well as the pen; the latter, needlework and such practices of good housewifery, as will make them useful servants and good wives. The fine sparkling eyes, the clean and healthful looks, and the intelligent countenances of these 400 boys, might safely have challenged comparison with the same number collected from all the ranks of society put together, and would have done credit to any.

Near the Porte St. Denis there is a small school, on a new plan, entitled L'Ecole Orthomatique, intended to simplify, promote, and extend education of the highest and most comprehensive kind. In November 1830, it had been established about two years, and the young people, of the most respectable families, had made a progress truly astonishing. One peculiarity of the plan, was that of learning the languages by means of translations in separate books—the tutor and the pupils alternately reading out loud distinctly, sentence by sentence, from the original and the translation; by which at any rate great progress had been in that time made, in the pronunciation of both the English and French languages, which were the only specimens exhibited. The late Mr. Day's delightful "History of Little Jack" is the first book used—then popular and concise histories, and so on: the first class read English history, and understand it perfectly. Amongst the scholars, twenty-two in number, were the two sons of the intrepid Canaris, the celebrated Greek patriot, who had acquired a good pronunciation of the French and English languages; and they were reported as having nearly as perfect a *general knowledge* of both. These two boys, of about ten and twelve years of age, possessed the most engaging noble countenances and manners possible; but what perhaps was most interesting of all, was to see the silent but eloquent expression of respect and pleasure beaming from the eyes of these, as well as of all the rest of the boys, including four or five other Greeks, on the entrance of the Comte Lasteyrie, the original and constant patron, the indefatigable friend and constant visiter of the school, and the delight scarcely to be restrained which was visible in the countenances of those who were the objects of the commendation or notice of this most benevolent, judicious, and unwearied benefactor of the human race. A leading feature in this institution seemed to be, that of active instead of passive employment—books were not merely put into the hands of the boys, and lessons given, but from those books they were expected to read in classes either to and with a tutor or a monitor—the teacher first of all reading over, and distinctly pronouncing, the words of the different sentences, and afterwards requiring such an explanation of the meaning, sentence by sentence, as showed that the scholar understood it. This principle was applied even to their hours of relaxation. Something useful, amusing, or improving, to the bodily and mental powers, was always soliciting attention, and preventing ennui and idleness; thus, when the intervals of relaxation arrived, the boys flew as eagerly to the machines and contrivances,

provided in a gravelled yard, for gymnastic exercises, as they previously had hastened to their dinners, and no scene more animated, or boys apparently more happy, could possibly exist.

To a person long and deeply impressed with the absolute necessity for beginning the work of Education at the earliest possible period of infancy, it was most gratifying to find from the *Compte*, that not merely were there infant schools in Paris and in most of the great towns, but that it was intended to engraft them on the general plan of National Education, and for children *of all classes*. There is an age before which the community, *as a community*, cannot advantageously interfere with or assist in the business of Education; but experience has now proved that *that* period may be a very early one, and if children had nothing to *unlearn* when they are old enough to be received into infant schools—happy would it be for both parents and children.

“Both Bacon and Locke,” says Dugald Stewart, in the conclusion of his first Dissertation on the Progress of Philosophy, “seem to have been fully aware (and I know of no philosopher before them of whom the same thing can be said) that the progressive improvement of the species is to be expected less from the culture of the *reasoning powers*, strictly so called, than from the prevention in early life of those artificial impressions and associations, by means of which, when once rivetted by habit, the strongest reason may be held in perpetual bondage. These impressions and associations may be likened to the slender threads which fastened Gulliver to the earth; and they are to be overcome, not by the sudden exertion of intellectual force, but by the gradual effect of good education, in breaking them asunder one by one. Since the revival of letters, seconded by the invention of printing, and by the Protestant Reformation, this process has been incessantly going on all over the Christian world; but it is chiefly in the course of the last century that the result has been visible to common observers. How many are the threads which even in Catholic countries have been broken by the writings of Locke! How many still remain to be broken before the mind of man can recover that moral liberty, which at some future period it seems destined to enjoy!”

That even sensible and reflecting parents should have been so long either blind or negligent enough not to perceive, that their children *learn something* from the moment of their birth, and that this obvious truth should not have been more generally acted upon than it has, at least in the way of prevention, is truly marvellous. But whilst, in addition to other causes which might be named, the ingenious idea prevails of charging on the Creator, the effects of the negligence, the blunders, and the sins of those into whose care infants are usually committed, it is not to be wondered at, that indolent parents should be found willing enough to shake off a responsibility which their own defective educations have but ill qualified them to encounter, with much chance of success. Responsibility, however, parents *cannot* shake off; and with whatever care, judgment, and anxiety they may select situations or tutors for their children, during that period of ten or fifteen years in which is usually included all that is meant by Education—early impressions will have been made, which may possibly influence the character and even the fate of the child through life—or at any rate, if those impressions are bad, as in nine cases out of ten they will



be, when the infant's mind is neglected, there will be much to be corrected. When once that disregarded law of human nature, which enacts, that "the first sensations\* experienced produce the greatest effects," and that "the earliest repetitions of one sensation after another produce the deepest habit," shall be generally and duly recognized, then will none but unnatural parents consign their offspring to the sport of chance; then will domestic Education,\* which can be begun by none with equal success as by a mother, be no longer neglected; and then will mothers in general, *for the first time*, experience the purest pleasures of parental affection, and be rewarded in return by the *lasting* as well as fervent attachment of their children.

"It is then A FACT, that the early sequences to which we are accustomed form the primary habits; and that the primary habits are the fundamental character of the man. The consequence is most important; for it follows, that as soon as the infant, or rather the embryo, begin to feel, the character begins to be formed; and the habits which are then contracted, are the most pervading and operative of all Education, then, or the care of forming the habits, ought to commence, as much as possible, with the period of sensation itself; and yet no period is its utmost vigilance of greater importance than the first." The object and end of Education—is happiness; and Intelligence, Temperance, and Benevolence, of which last the two parts, Generosity, and Justice, are the grand qualities of the mind through which this end is to be attained. The question then is, "how can those early sequences be made to take place on which the habits conducive to intelligence, temperance, and benevolence are founded; and how can those sequences, on which are founded the vices opposite to those virtues, be prevented?"†

"If then Education be to communicate the art of happiness, and if intelligence consists of two parts—a knowledge of the order of those events of nature on which our pleasures and pains depend—and the sagacity which discovers the best means for the attaining of ends—the question whether the people should be educated, is the same with the question whether they should be happy or miserable." "This momentous question has been for some years set at rest; the only question now remaining, being, as Lord Brougham says, in his unanswerable pamphlet, whether they shall be *well* or *ill* taught.

Ireland, that land of anomalies and strange inconsistencies, which has been and continues to be quoted as affording evidence of the inadequacy of Education to inspire industry, to repress crime, to confer happiness, in reality furnishes a most decisive proof of the truth of this assertion. Those who use unhappy Ireland as an argument against educating all classes of the people, ignorantly or wilfully state only a part of the facts of the case. It is true, as is stated, that the people

---

\* "By domestic Education, we denote all that the child hears and sees, more especially all it is made to suffer or enjoy at the hands of others, and all that it is allowed or constrained to do, in the house in which it is born and bred, which we shall consider, generally, as the parental."—Supplement to Ency. Brit. vol. iv. p. 25.

† This important question is more ably, and, at the same time, concisely, answered in the article "Education," before referred to, in the 4th vol. of the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica, than in any other place with which I am acquainted. The whole of the article (Education) ought to be the manual, and in the hands of every parent.

of Ireland are *almost universally* educated;\* and it is also too true, that "crowded gaols, ferocious turbulence, habitual slothfulness, gloomy bigotry," are traits in the Irish character constantly exhibited to public view. But there is defective and bad, as well as comprehensive and good, Education. In addition to the authorities below quoted for the prevalence of Education in Ireland, we have that of the Commissioners for Education in that country, in their Eleventh Report, in support of another and equally unquestionable fact, which is, that the Irish are every where "eagerly anxious for the education of their children."† The question, therefore, as relates to Ireland, as well as elsewhere, is not whether the people shall be educated, but whether they shall be well or ill taught. Now the fact appears to be—the unquestionable and melancholy fact—that in Ireland the people are *ill* taught. Mr. Wakefield says, "As to the manner in which it (Education) is conveyed, I cannot speak in terms of *sufficient reprobation*."

The common schoolmaster is generally a man originally intended for the priesthood;\* but whose morals had been too bad, or his habitual idleness so deeply rooted, as to prevent his improving himself sufficiently for that office. To persons of this kind the education of the poor is entirely entrusted; and the consequence is that their pupils imbibe from them enmity to England, hatred to the government, and superstitious veneration for old and absurd customs.‡ Mr. Dutton, in his survey of Clare,§ says, "the state of Education may be easily appreciated, when it is known that, with the exception of a few Universal Spelling Books, the general cottage Classics are—History of the Seven Champions of Christendom—Montelian, Knight of the Oracle—Paris-mus and Parismenes—Irish Rogues and Rapparees—Francis, a notorious robber, teaching them the most dexterous modes of robbing—History of the most celebrated Pirates—Jack the Bachelor, a noted Smuggler—Fair Rosamond, and Jane Shore—Donna Rozina, a Spanish Courtesan—Ovid's Art of Love—History of Witches and Apparitions—The Devil and Doctor Faustus—Moll Flanders, highly edifying, no doubt!—¶ New System of Boxing, by Mendoza, &c. Whilst these are the books," adds Mr. Dutton, "from which our poor have their education, it can hardly be expected that the lives of pirates, dexterous thieves, witches, smugglers, and illustrious prostitutes, can have any but the very worst tendency." Mr. Wakefield confirms the fact of the books above enumerated, being common: "I met with nearly the same in the county of Wicklow," says he; "and I found such, or as bad, in very general use." Amongst a curious description of many schools, Mr. Dutton mentions the two following: "In the Mountains of Broadford one school contains upwards of sixty of both sexes, at 1s. 7½d. and 2s. 3d. per quarter; they are taught the Universal Spelling Book, *Alibaba*, and the *Seven Sleepers*. \* There is a very numerous school kept in the Roman Catholic Chapel at Killaloe; it contains several grown boys and girls; and when I visited it unexpectedly, I surprised

\* Of this fact, strange as it may at first sight appear, there can be no doubt, from the unquestionable testimony of Wakefield, Weld, Ensor, and other respectable authors.

† These are the words of Wakefield, who adds, "that he knows of no part of Ireland 'so wild' as to furnish an exception—Wakefield's Ireland, vol. ii. p. 397.

‡ Wakefield's Ireland, vol. ii. p. 398.

§ Page 335.

two of these learning their lessons in a very loving manner—the gentleman's arm around the young lady's waist; the master was absent." The remarks made by Mr. Townsend, in his survey of the County of Cork, on the education of the common people in Ireland, is to the same effect; all contributing to prove, beyond a doubt, that for the most part the people of Ireland, instead of being *well* are *ill* taught, and that crowded gaols, ferocious turbulence, habitual slothfulness, and gloomy bigotry, are the natural and necessary consequences.

There are, not less unfortunately for themselves than for others, many persons in the world who care not for the misery of the people, provided it does not interfere with *their* pleasures, *their* personal views and enjoyments; and all such are either openly or covertly opposed to the dissemination of knowledge. But in this they are miserably mistaken, and foolishly and wickedly selfish; for they can now as easily stop with their hand the flux and reflux of the tides, where they rise highest, as they can stay the current of knowledge, which has set in with more than a spring-tide force. They may deteriorate the quality of the knowledge—they may substitute the evil for the good—they may repress at one time, only to produce a greater out-bursting at another; but in doing all this, they are only blind instruments to their own destruction. In these times of change, which are the genuine and necessary result of unreformed abuses, of grievances unredressed, and of obstinate perseverance in maintaining institutions, perhaps well suited to *past*, but not at all calculated for the wants, the circumstances, and the superior information of the *present* times,\* the safety of persons and property depends upon the general spread of knowledge—of that knowledge which results, and results *only*, from an Education inspiring intelligence, the necessary consequences of which are temperance, generosity, and justice. It is worse than vain to expect figs from thorns, or grapes from thistles. Verily, "as a man soweth so also shall he reap:" and it is in political, as in moral and social Education.

"When the political machine is such, that the grand objects of desire are seen to be the reward, not of virtue, not of talent, but of subservience to the will and command over the affections of the ruling few; that interest with *the man above*, is the only sure means to the next step in wealth, or power, or consideration, and so on; the means of pleasing the man above become, in that case, the great object of pursuit. And as the favours of the man above are necessarily limited,—as some therefore of the Candidates for his favour can only obtain the objects of their desire by disappointing others,—the arts of supplanting rise into importance; and that whole tribe of faculties which is expressed by the words intrigue, flattery, backbiting, treachery, &c., is the fruitful offspring of that political Education, which a government, in which the interests of the subject many, are but a secondary object, cannot fail to produce."† This misgovernment carries within itself the seeds of its own dissolution; and when the day of reckoning comes, *as come it will*—and the power reverts to the people, *as it is sure to do sooner or later*—then will the difference be seen between the conduct of a well-educated, and, consequently, a generous and just; and that of an ignorant, mistaught, and of necessity barbarous,

---

\* See Hartley on Man.

† Art. Education, Ency. Brit.

people. Under provocation much greater, in danger more imminent, midst the slaughter of neighbours, friends, brothers, children, parents,—what in 1830 restrained their fury, and rendered the population of Paris humane and generous conquerors,—whilst in 1792, the mere threat of that which was in 1830 actually attempted, and in part executed; excited the people to frenzy, and made them the blind instruments of furious demagogues, the indiscriminate murderers of friends and foes, the perpetrators of every act which could outrage and disgrace humanity? Purposely kept in a state of as profound ignorance, and slavish dependence, as possible, under the old regime, the moral and political Education of the great mass of the people, up to the period of the Revolution, had been in the courts of kings. Tyrants by their example had been their great instructors; cruelty, oppression, and contumely had severed the kindly ties of social life, and substituted hatred where should have been attachment. The exhibition of frequent and sanguinary punishments had given the people a taste for blood. Treated like brutes, was it to be wondered at that they became savages? The acts of vengeance of those who called themselves their superiors, had taught them revenge; the barbarities they had practised for ages were only re-acted on a more condensed scale; the people had their St. Bartholomew's day: in fine, the vices of the Court—intrigue, calumny, espionage, treachery, hatred of knowledge—became the adopted vices of the people.\* In 1830, many of the actors, and most of the leaders of the people, had been taught in schools of mutual instruction and other establishments for rational Education, and as was to be expected, *they* gave the tone to the rest: the children of 1792 were the grown up men of 1830—they occupied the places of the ignorant, mistaught, and therefore misled, monsters of the former period, who were gone off the stage, and many of whom had met with untimely ends. A generation, with few exceptions, had passed away, or was in great measure superseded by another generation, who not only inherited the bitter effects of the crimes of their predecessors—first, in the establishment of a military despotism, and afterwards in the return of the old Bourbons—but who had been taught by passing events, well aided by a sometimes free, but always bold Press, that liberty, when acquired, must be maintained by public order.† Hence that “marked feature of the Revolution”—which cannot be better described than in the words of a justly popular periodical publication:‡ “A population, unaided, unguided, unofficered, by the mere force of moral and physical courage, in three days, achieve for themselves the possession of absolute power; the first and only use they make of that power is to divest themselves of it, and place it in the hands most qualified to wield it for the true interests of their country. This circumstance it is which makes the Revolution stand alone in the annals of the world, and afford a lesson both to kings and people which cannot be mistaken.”

\* From the time of Catherine de Medicis, who trained her maids of honour as Courtesans, the manners of the Court of France seems to have been inferior in decency to those of a well-regulated Bagnio.

† The motto on the buttons of the regimentals of the National Guard is “Liberté, Ordre publique.”

‡ The New Monthly and London Magazine for Sept. 1830.

If any thing still more direct and practical were wanting to show the excellence, and to prove the beneficial effects of universal Education, both to individuals and governments, the facts published by M. Dupin, under the title of "*Carte figurative de l'Instruction populaire de la France*," would supply that deficiency. On a map of the outline of the different departments, figures are marked, denoting the number of children educated in each department in proportion to its whole population. Thus, in the department of the Moselle, that proportion is one in ten of the population; whereas in the department of the Haute Loire, it is only one in 268 of the inhabitants. From this statistical chart, it appears that Education abounds most in the northern departments. M. Dupin divides by an imaginary line drawn from St. Malo on the north-west, to Geneva on the south-east, of France, 32 departments, which he calls the departments of the north, from the other 54 departments, which he calls the departments of the south. These 32 northern departments have a territorial superficies of 18,692,191 hectares of land, and include a population of 13,663,914 in 20,142 communes, of which 15,701 have schools, whilst 4,441 are without. The 54 southern departments contain 53,533,426 hectares of land, have 17,936,086 inhabitants, are divided into 18,337 communes, of which only 8,669 have schools, 9,668 being without. From the chart it appears, that the primary schools of the 32 northern departments contained 740,846 élèves in the year 1826, while those of the south contained only 375,931 children, little more than one-half that number; that there were at that time 1,323 of the élèves of the Polytechnic School belonging to the 32 departments of the north, and 700 from the southern departments; that of the Members of the Academy of Science, there were 54 Members natives of the former, and 17 of the latter; and, that of the Brevets d'invention (patents) granted from 1789 to 1825, 1699 of the inventors belonged to some one or other of the northern departments, whilst only 413 resided in the southern. The results of this more extended Education in the north than in the south of France are equally conspicuous, both as regards the intelligence, the property, and the comfort of individuals, and the revenues of the state. In 1819, out of 400 medals distributed by the King, as rewards of industry and ingenuity, 293 were bestowed upon residents in the 32 northern departments, whilst from the 54 southern departments there were only 107 successful claimants. The annual value of private property in the northern departments, notwithstanding the great difference in territorial extent, is stated by M. Dupin at 800,600,000 francs, and that of the southern at 825,400,000; the income of each individual on an average of the whole in the former at 60 francs 80 cents, in the latter at only 47 francs 75 cents; and the yearly value of each hectare of land in the north at 42 francs 83 cents, and in the south at 23 francs 69 cents. Finally, the 32 departments of the north contribute to the exigencies of the state 53,318,596 francs; the 54 departments of the south 25,544,584 only! Decisive as these facts are as to some of the advantages of the Education of all classes, and encouraging as they are in reference to its present state in France, there is reason to think, that the advances it has made might have been described in still more satisfactory terms.

M. Dupin took for his authority the Returns to the University for

the year 1820. Those returns appear not to have been in all cases correct: whether from inadvertency, or from an inclination to report unfavourably of establishments viewed with jealousy by the then ruling powers, or from some other cause, there is no doubt but that both the number of schools, and scholars in some, perhaps many departments, were under-rated. That this took place, in particular in the department of the Indre and Loire, there can be no doubt. The figures on the chart denote that only one individual in 229 was in the course of Education in that department: whereas M. Duvau, a considerable landholder in the neighbourhood of Tours, asserts, that previous to 1828 there were 300 schools, and 8,500 pupils: and, consequently, that they bore the proportion nearly of one in thirty-three to the population of the department.

It may be then safely concluded, and indeed no other warranted or legitimate conclusion *can* be come to—that upon the Education of the people depends their character and happiness, and the peace, the welfare, and stability of society: that to effect this best, it must be free from religious dogmas, and must be not only universal, but in itself of the most extensive kind—Education, domestic, social, political. And it cannot be too generally or practically understood—that Education, properly so called, is not confined to schools, colleges, and institutions for teaching, or to any particular period of life (though unquestionably youth is the genial season), but that, co-existent with life itself, it begins with the first breath inspired, and ends only when man ceases to breathe.

#### EFFECTS OF PROPORTIONS IN THE NUMBER OF POPULATION.

From all that has been said, it must be evident that the important power of increasing, or of diminishing, the reward of labour, is, by the essential order of society, placed in the hands of the labourers themselves. Irregularities in the seasons bringing on scarcity and famine, foreign incursions, or domestic commotions, destroying property, or suspending production by rendering it insecure, may sometimes occasion a depression of wages, which no prudence on the part of the labouring classes can avert or mitigate. But under all ordinary circumstances, when the usual course of nature is preserved, and when law and order are maintained, it depends upon the labouring classes themselves whether wages shall ascend to the ultimate maximum, or sink to the extreme minimum. By duly regulating their numbers, in relation to the extent and fertility of the soil, they enlarge the range of maximum wages; and by regulating their numbers, in relation to the component parts of capital employed, they cause actual wages to ascend to their ultimate maximum.

Under such circumstances every improvement in agriculture—every addition to mechanical power—every new facility afforded to communication and transport—every thing, in short, which reduces the cost of bringing the necessities of life to market, raises at one and the same time both possible and actual wages, bestows upon the labouring classes more ample means of comfort and enjoyment, and lifts them to a higher place upon the scale of society.

On the other hand, when the labouring classes allow their numbers to bear a high proportion, either to the extent of fertile land, or to the amount of capital applicable to their maintenance, wages will settle down to the extreme minimum, below which animal existence cannot be sustained. Under such circumstances, every fluctuation of the seasons, every stagnation or revulsion in trade, will bring down upon the labouring population all the miseries of want, and degrade them to a state more precarious and wretched than that of negro servitude.—*Robert Torrens.*

## FREEDOM OF COMMERCIAL INTERCOURSE BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE.

THIS is a subject which has of late years engaged public attention to a great extent—though not at all greater than its importance warrants. The mission of Mr. Poulett Thomson, Sir Henry Parnell, and Dr. Bowring, for a time inspired very sanguine hopes of success; but the result has not equalled the expectation. Having had occasion to visit Paris soon after the late Revolution, we enjoyed the advantage of frequent personal intercourse with the King, Louis-Philippe, with General Lafayette, Monsieur Odilon Barrot, Monsieur Lafitte, the great banker of France, and then Prime Minister, and Monsieur Thiers, the leading Member of the French Administration in the Chamber of Deputies. In the course of the interviews enjoyed with each of these, we endeavoured to impress on their minds the great benefits which could not fail to result from the relaxation of the commercial restrictions which kept the two nations, England and France, from reciprocally aiding each other. The uniform answer given to these representations was, that it might be very desirable to try the experiment; but if it should fail there would be no possibility of returning back to the prohibitive system, if once given up. We then undertook to lay before the Ministers the outline of an experiment which might be made to a limited amount, and for a limited time, without altering the law at all; but leaving any revision of it until the experiment should be tried: when if it should prove successful, it would furnish the best excuse for such revision; and if not, the law being unaltered would of course remain in full force. The proposition was favourably entertained, and we were requested to submit it in writing, so that it might be considered and discussed in all its bearings and details. As the issue of this negotiation, and the causes assigned for the difficulty of carrying it out into action, may be regarded as very striking illustrations of the slender degree of hope which exists for effecting any change in our commercial relations with France, until a complete change shall take place in the constitution of the representative body, we subjoin the statement presented to the French Ministry at the period referred to, and the answer obtained. The statement was as follows:

### *Proposed Extension of Commerce between France and England.*

In every part of France the stagnation of commerce is the subject of general complaint; and as the welfare and stability of every state must depend greatly on the general prosperity of its agriculture, manufactures, and trade, there is no question of greater importance, or that has a stronger claim on the attention of the French Ministry than this: namely—"By what means can the commerce of France be most speedily and most effectively revived?"

If we inquire into the causes of the evil, we shall find them to be these—first, an inadequacy in the means of consumption as compared with the means of production; and secondly, a general want of confidence in mercantile stability, which suspends even the ordinary operations of these already inadequate means.

By the first of these causes, goods of every kind are multiplied to great accumulation beyond the existing demand; and prices fall by reason of the known superabundance thus produced. By the second, the fall of prices is taken to be the symptom of an approaching crisis, from which every one is desirous of escaping, and therefore contracts his operations of expenditure till confidence is restored.

A knowledge of these sources of the evil, indicates the nature of the remedies best to be applied; which are simply these:—Establish a just proportion between the means of consumption and the means of production, and restore public confidence in the stability of commercial affairs.

If the power of production be already greatly in advance beyond the means of consumption, there are only two possible modes of restoring the balance between them; the first is, to arrest the former in its too rapid march; the second, to accelerate the latter till it is made to keep pace with its competitor.

The first of these is impossible, without a great destruction of existing property, and without extreme injustice to the right which every man has, to use his inventive faculties to augment the productive powers of the present and the future.

The second is then the only alternative left; and this is happily just, practicable, and effective; capable of producing immense immediate benefit, of establishing a most important public principle, and of laying the foundation of great future good; as well as of restoring that confidence in the stability of affairs, which, added to an increased consumption of the superabundance produced, can alone relieve the existing embarrassments of trade, or avert the more dreadful calamity of a crisis that will augment in weight by every day of increased protraction.

The ex-ministers of France, actuated no doubt by the purest motives, acknowledged the existence of great commercial difficulty, and avowed it to be their duty to provide a remedy for the evil, when they voted in the Chamber of Deputies, an advance of thirty millions of francs, to prop up falling establishments, and to keep many thousand workmen still in employ.

If these thirty millions had been actually *expended* by the government, in the purchase of existing merchandize, either for exportation to distant countries, or for gratuitous distribution among the necessitous at home, so that it effectually drew out of the hands of the manufacturers, for actual consumption, the surplus stores that now fill their magazines, it would have been a real relief to all these branches of trade; for in that case the thousands of workmen might be usefully and profitably employed in replacing the goods thus purchased and consumed, and the evil of superabundance beyond the means of sale, would not have recurred until the goods so consumed had all been reproduced again.



But as the sum advanced by the ministers was merely a *loan* to different establishments, to be repaid with interest in a given period ; as no goods were purchased either for distant exportation, or for home consumption, but on the contrary, a new power of production was placed in the hands of those whose greatest misfortune it was to have produced, in relation to the means of sale, far too much already ; the evil is not in the slightest degree alleviated by the thirty millions thus advanced. Nothing, in short, is gained by it, except a temporary and deceitful calm : during which the evil of excessive production beyond the means of consumption will go on increasing ; and thus the elements of a new tempest will be gathering fresh strength every day, so as to make the crisis only more terrible when it next arrives. If the merchants and manufacturers, for the reasons already assigned, be unable to meet their private engagements now, how will it be possible, without new means of accelerating consumption, for them to repay the advances made to them by the state ; when their surplus produce shall have been increased still more, by means of these advances, beyond the power of sale ; when prices of all kinds of goods will be lower, by reason of this abundance, and when no sacrifice will turn goods into money, or avert the hursting of the storm ?

What is wanted to relieve the stagnant commerce of France, is *not* the advance of capital by the state, in order to augment production, but the giving, by some appropriate encouragement, a new and powerful impulse to consumption, and favouring, by every possible way, the sale of the existing superabundance before new supplies are created.

The science of political economy has established this most important truth—that monopolies, restrictions, and prohibitions, are as injurious to the welfare of nations, as the fetters of any other kind that may be imposed on the free exercise of the rights and liberties of men.

Nevertheless, such monopolies, restrictions, and prohibitions, are maintained by some nations, on the plea that they are necessary retaliations for similar impositions existing elsewhere ; and it thus happens, that with the ministers and people of countries in which the importance of free commerce is most highly appreciated and best understood, there is an unwillingness to be the first to carry it into practice, from the fear that a corresponding disposition to meet such an advance, might not be found in those other nations to whom this freedom of commerce might be first offered.

It would be easy to show that the value of free trade, like the value of truth, virtue, or justice, does not depend upon the reciprocal exercise of it by others ; but that it would be beneficial on the whole to the nation that would first admit it among themselves, whether other people followed their example or not.

Being unwilling, however, to excite any undue alarm in the minds of those who are not yet prepared to admit this great principle of unlimited freedom of trade, I shall not propose this as a remedy for the existing stagnation of commerce in France ; but confine myself to the proposition of a mode by which the fair operation of this principle may be tried, for a limited period, on a limited scale, and for a specific object ; in short on a basis of such perfect safety, as will leave open the power of rectifying any inconvenience that may be apprehended to arise in the progress of the experiment. It will preserve the existing laws

in full force for every other operation excepting only the experiment proposed; and it will leave to the ministry the power of determining, by actual experience, whether the free or the restrictive system of commerce is best.

The ultimate object that I propose is to cause the sum of fifty millions of francs to be expended in Paris alone, in the course of about three months: twenty-five millions in the *actual* purchase of French produce and manufactures of every sort and kind, for exportation to and sale in England; and twenty-five millions in the *probable* collateral expenditure arising from out of the first operation itself.

The mode by which I propose to effect this, will be new, striking, and original; but my confidence in the wisdom and liberality of the existing ministers of both England and France, forbids me to suppose for a moment that its novelty will be any objection, if its utility be well established; I proceed, therefore, to detail the nature of my plan.

I ask, then, the government of France to authorise me to communicate to the principal manufacturing towns of England, their permission to import from thence, free of all tax, duty, or impost whatsoever, the amount of one million sterling of British goods; the proceeds of which, to the same amount, to be re-invested in the purchase of one million sterling's worth of French produce and manufactures, for exportation to and sale in England: thus relieving the commerce of France, by an actual purchase to the extent named, of its present superabundant merchandise in every branch.

To realize to France the full advantages which this operation is calculated to create, I propose the security of the following conditions:—

*First*—That the British goods imported shall be in the greatest possible variety, so that no disproportionate quantity of any one sort or kind shall be predominate over the other; but that the importations shall include specimens of every description of article manufactured in Great Britain.

*Secondly*—That they shall be imported by the way of Havre, Rouen, and the Seine, and not opened either for inspection or sale until their arrival at Paris.

*Thirdly*—That they shall not be distributed among the purchasers, except from some great central depot in the capital, fixed on by the government itself.

*Fourthly*—That no portion whatever of the amount arising from the sale shall be remitted to England in money; but that the sums produced shall be deposited, as fast as they are realized, in the bank of France, there to remain, until ultimately employed in the exclusive purchase of French produce and manufactures, in equal variety to those brought from England, including specimens of every thing made or produced in France, to be forwarded by the same route of the Seine, Rouen, and Havre, and there embarked in French ships to England for sale.

*Fifthly*—That the profits arising from this transaction—that is, the sum that may remain in the bank of France after the re-investment of the one million sterling, (the prime cost of the English goods) in French articles, and the payment of the necessary charges—be divided into three equal portions.

*Sixthly*—The first portion of the profits to be given to the proprietors or importers of the goods brought from England for this public sale.

*Seventhly*—The second portion of the profits to be employed in the erection of a public monument in some part of Paris, after a design from French artists, to be mutually approved by the contracting parties, suitable to the commemoration of this friendly, liberal, and advantageous example of the reciprocal interchange of the surplus wealth of the two countries.

*Eighthly*—The third portion of the profits to be devoted to the aid of the expedition round the globe, now preparing under my direction, for the promotion of discovery, commerce, and civilization, in the eastern seas, in the ultimate benefits of which England and France may be made equal participators.

The local advantages that would result to Paris alone by its being thus made, for a certain time, the great central depot for the interchange of the productive industry of the two greatest nations of the world, would be immense, because of the enormous number of visitors and purchasers that would be thus attracted to the capital from all parts of Europe. If, for instance, the authority to make this free importation should be accorded, in the present month, it might be at once announced throughout all Europe that in the great week of July, when the weather would be favourable for travellers visiting Paris, and the days long for such an exhibition, one of the modes by which the anniversary of the late happy revolution would be celebrated, would be the opening in Paris of an immense and splendid museum, containing specimens of every description of article produced or manufactured in Great Britain, and a corresponding museum, containing specimens of every article grown or made in France, for ultimate exchange with each other, and for reciprocal consumption in the two countries named.

Such an announcement, if given early, and with all due authority, would attract to the capital, at the period spoken of, at least 10,000 visitors alone from the different countries of Europe, who would come merely to see collected together in one spot, the finest specimens of human skill that the whole world could produce; but which no expenditure of time or money could enable them to see under such advantageous circumstances again at any period of their lives.

The attraction to purchasers would be still stronger, because every one who lives by supplying the wants or the wishes of others, soon learns that novelty, variety, and beauty, are charms that operate most powerfully on his customers; and accordingly, tradesmen from every provincial town in France, as well as from many of the adjoining countries, would be induced to undertake a journey to Paris, during this anniversary of the great week, because, while gratifying their patriotism or their curiosity, they might hope to repay the expenses of their journey by selecting from the great museum of manufactures opened at Paris, (in which every thing is rare and curious, costly and magnificent, useful and cheap, might be found in endless variety,) such articles as might be best adapted for sale in the town to which he would return, and where a corresponding profit might be realized on his purchase. It would be a moderate expectation to believe that 100,000 buyers might be drawn to Paris from different parts of the country by this cause alone.

If to the mere visitors from curiosity, and the purchasers of British goods, be added those who would come as sellers, bringing their French produce to the French museum, and thus relieving themselves of their superabundant stocks, it might be deemed quite probable that 200,000 persons at least would be added to the population of Paris.

It would be needless to show in detail, how such an influx of persons and money into the capital, and the consequent expenditure of a large sum by each new comer, among its permanent inhabitants, would infuse new life into every branch of commerce in the capital itself. Some of the most splendid cities of the ancient world owed all their wealth and grandeur to this single cause, namely, the constant attraction of population by these great commercial speculations of exchange, having indeed no other sources of gain. Such were, in the remotest times, Tyre and Sidon, in Phœnecia; Alexandria, in Egypt; and Palmyra, in the desert of Syria; and, in the middle ages, Aden, in Arabia; Ormuz, in the Persian Gulf; and Leghorn, Genoa, and Venice, in Europe. The operation of the same principle is felt every year in London and Paris, each of which, when emptied of its wealthy inhabitants, is dull, gloomy, and inactive; and each of which, when replenished by a returning population, which the court and senate bring in their train, is inspired with new commercial life by increased expenditure, and augmented circulation. The great commercial fairs of Kiachta, in Russia, on the borders of the Chinese empire; of Astrakhan, on the Caspian Sea; of Hudwar, in the north of India; and of Leipsic, in Germany, are still existing examples of great annual benefit springing from the source described; while the great city of Mecca, the Palmyra of modern times, though surrounded by burning and barren sands, and without a single pleasure to offer to its visitors, draws to itself, under the pretence of a religious pilgrimage, but in reality by the magic wand of commercial interest, and the hope of gain, not less than half a million of visitors from every quarter of the Mahomedan world.

The effect of these great trading journeys to the different places named is two-fold; for first, each of the exchanging traders finds sufficient benefit from his purchases and sales to pay all the costs of his travelling to and fro, and to leave him an adequate profit as a compensation for his time and trouble; while the cities themselves, which are the scenes of these great assemblages of merchants, benefit so largely by the concourse of people drawn to them during their stay, as to acquire wealth enough to maintain their whole population in comparative ease, until the next returning pilgrimage or fair shall renew their annual source of gain.

The assembling of Parliament in England, the triennial musical festivals, the thronging of visitors at particular seasons to the watering-places, are all illustrations on a small scale, of the same principle; but the attraction I propose for Paris being so much greater than any that the world has ever yet seen, and mingling together the powerful motives of rational and scientific curiosity with the love of gain, would draw together a greater concourse of people, and consequently produce a more powerfully beneficial effect than any effort of a similar kind that ever preceded it.

If Paris itself would benefit thus largely by the plan I propose, every

department of France would be more or less a participator in the advantages thus produced. The transit of the merchandize from Havre, by way of Rouen, and the Seine, would necessarily give great employment to ships, boats, men, and horses, in the way. The journeys of strangers, whether as mere visitors or as purchasers, would benefit all the departments through which they would have to pass. The transport of French goods from the provinces to the capital, where they would alone be purchased with the money produced by the English sales, would give new life and activity to the canals, roads, carriages, waggons, horses and people, employed in their conveyance, and relieve, beyond any other plan that could be devised, the commerce of France from the stagnation that now afflicts it; for as when a mighty river that has been obstructed in its flow by ice, is set in motion by the genial approach of summer, all the supplying rills and rivulets that feed it are set in motion also; so, though Paris would apparently be the most active scene, every village and every cottage lying near the roads communicating with the capital, in whatever direction, or however remote, would feel its influence also.

Let it not be supposed, that by admitting the million's-worth of English goods, free of all duty or impost, the revenue of the state would loose any of its receipts:—Certainly not: for, without such a permission as this, the goods will never come. Neither let it be supposed that the million's-worth of French goods would be sold in the ordinary course of things, whether the English were admitted freely or not. No such thing would happen. The very stagnation complained of, arises entirely from all the ordinary inhabitants of Paris and of France possessing already as much as they are disposed to purchase, of articles familiar to them, and of which they buy only what is indispensable. Take as an example, therefore, a family thus provided, and it would be difficult to make them expend 100 francs in any thing of French produce, of which they have enough already. But lead the same family through a museum filled with every thing that is new, striking, curious, and fashionable, because rare and not always easy of access, and they will be tempted to expend 1000 francs to surround themselves with what they before could not have possessed. Will it be thought that the 1000 francs thus excited or drawn from the rich, or moderately wealthy, is expended in the encouragement of British industry *exclusively*? No such thing. The whole amount is to be ultimately expended in French articles to be exported to England for sale: and therefore the real effect of the plan will be to cause an expenditure of 1000 francs in support of French industry, where 100 only would have been expended without it; besides all the collateral good arising from the immense expenditure of money, in lodgings, provisions, conveyance, amusements, journals, books, and the endless variety of channels into which money would flow; thus making the rich contribute, by a voluntary, agreeable, and useful expenditure of their wealth, to reward the industry and skill of their humbler countrymen.

The devotion of a portion of the profits to the two objects already named, would crown the whole with appropriate honour and reward. The French government has always given liberal patronage to the arts; and, but the other day, when 30 millions were voted for the relief of trade, 300,000 francs were also voted to defray the cost of bringing from Egypt two granite obelisks to adorn the capital of France. The

monument to be erected out of the second portion of the profits of this proposed operation will not cost the state a single *sous*, and will be more beautiful, more appropriate, and more popularly acceptable than one arising from almost any other source. The French government has also been a liberal promoter of Voyages of Discovery, and has expended some millions on that object alone. The third portion of the profits proposed will aid an Expedition having far higher objects than mere discovery, or mere science; because uniting commerce and civilization with these, and therefore perfecting all that has gone before.

This Expedition has already received the high approbation of the Royal Families of England and France, of the leading nobility and men of science in both countries, and of the community of both nations generally. All that is wanted to complete its success, is, that the respective governments of both should crown the efforts which the zeal of individuals began. This, then, is a mode in which they *can* assist it, without asking from the state a solitary franc. All that is needed is the mere permission to effect the importation of merchandize proposed; and this the government of France can grant, if so disposed. That the government of England will meet such an advance in a liberal spirit of perfect reciprocity, cannot for a moment be doubted, more especially since the late happy changes in its administration; while the merchants and manufacturers of England may be equally relied on for their cordial co-operation with France in so great an undertaking; particularly after the manner in which, by their addresses, deputations, and subscriptions, they have evinced their admiration of the great mass of the regenerated and emancipated people of a country once considered their enemies and rivals, but now regarded as their neighbours and their friends.

I submit, therefore, to the French government, the adoption of the plan I propose; I ask them to accord to me the permission to carry it into effect, and I await their frank and early reply.

Paris, Nov. 22, 1830.

J. S. BUCKINGHAM.

To this, there was a greater difficulty in obtaining a specific answer than had at first been imagined; but having attended the Chamber of Deputies with Mons. Laffitte, and afterwards driving home to the hotel of the minister of finance, with one of the principal secretaries, Mons. Thiers, I was led to understand, that highly as the proposition was approved by those who were sufficiently well informed on the advantages of free trade to appreciate the benefits that could not fail to result from such an exchange being carried into effect, the Chamber contained so large a portion of individuals personally interested in the maintenance of restrictions, monopolies, and exclusive privileges, that if such a proposition were brought before the Deputies (and without their sanction it could not take place), there was not the least chance of its success.

Such then, was the fate of this proposition, which, like many others that have from time to time been produced, failed, not because of its own imperfections, but because it interfered with the interests of those who were sufficiently united to carry any question by which their own fortunes might be increased, and sufficiently powerful to defeat every measure that did not promise them an equivalent of individual gain.

We fear, therefore, that so long as the British House of Commons shall contain so great a number as it does at present of large land-owners, personally interested in preventing the importation of French corn; and so long as the French Chamber of Deputies contains so large a number of proprietors of iron mines, and silk, cotton, and woollen manufactories, it will be in vain to expect any greater freedom of commerce between the two countries than at present exists: though it is difficult to imagine anything more cruel, or more absurd, than the conduct of those two Governments towards their respective subjects; who have each a surplus, the one of agricultural, the other of manufactured productions, which are useless to themselves because they are in excess above their own wants; and which they would gladly exchange to the mutual enrichment of both parties by the operation; but who are prevented from thus conferring upon each other the greatest mutual benefits, in order to uphold the sordid and selfish interests of the large proprietors in both countries, between whom the labouring classes of each are thus cruelly sacrificed. Things cannot long remain thus.

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR.

### DESIRABILITY OF DISPENSING WITH THE SERVICES OF LAWYERS.

SIR,

*Lincoln, March 27th, 1834.*

It is truly appalling to witness the increasing power of the Lawyers, the last instance of which is the promotion of Sir Thomas Denman to the Peerage, perhaps the fittest lawyer in the kingdom for the dignity. Nevertheless, it gives rise to melancholy reflections to think that any man should be sent to the House of Lords whose profession requires him to advocate right or wrong, as he may happen to be retained. I hope my countrymen will endeavour to do without the lawyers after they have regulated the Church Establishment, which, with all its faults, does not require reformation half so much as the Law.

I think much might be accomplished if the people would determine to employ lawyers as seldom as possible. The merchants and shipowners are beginning to act upon this principle. When a merchant agrees with a shipowner for the use of his ship, a printed charter-party, or agreement for charter, is purchased, the blanks for date, names of the contracting parties, ship, and captain, nature of the voyage, terms, &c. are filled up, and the document is signed in the presence of a witness. If a complicated arrangement like this, involving several hundreds, nay, sometimes thousands of pounds, can be effected without the interposition of lawyers, why cannot we have printed forms of leases, notices to quit, mortgages, conveyances, wills, &c.?

I believe County Courts for the recovery of debts, and a Registration of Deeds for each County, if made as perfect as it is possible to make them, would be a great step towards a thorough Law Reform, but I do not think you and the few independent Members in the House of Commons can prevent these great measures from being spoiled, so baneful is the influence of the lawyers.

I am, Sir, your most obedient Servant,

A CONSTANT READER.

## EVIL OF RATING THE LANDLORDS INSTEAD OF THE TENANTS OF SMALL HOUSES.

SIR,

*Stourbridge, March 27, 1834.*

Finding from the Report of the Commissioners for inquiring into the Poors' Laws, that it contains a recommendation that the *landlords* of houses under 15*l.* per annum rent should be assessed to the *poors'-rates*, I am induced to draw your attention to this subject, in order that a measure, at once, so anomalous, so partial, unjust, and oppressive, should meet with a decided opposition from you, Sir, and all who advocate an equal and impartial mode of taxation, and the relieving those classes chiefly labouring under the burthen of taxation.

It is clear that taxes cannot be too general and impartial, and that where they are otherwise, they ought not to be continued, and still less be now imposed.

That the Legislature ought particularly to avoid imposing taxes which weigh chiefly, or solely, on the middle or the working classes, already too greatly burthened in this country.

And that no measure, unless imperiously required by necessity, ought to be adopted, having a direct tendency to depreciate any species of property.

The measure recommended, ought to be reprobated and opposed, on each and all of these grounds, inasmuch, as a branch of the middle and the working classes would alone be oppressed by such imposition, and this kind of property be depreciated by it.

Either the landlords of such houses must raise the rents, and thus compel the working class, the tenants, to pay that which they are little able to pay, or the landlords must pay the rates without any equivalent. The latter effect would be the imposition of a species of property-tax upon a class of persons, already as *occupants*, contributing to the *poors'-rates*, and otherwise burthened with taxation; whilst the aristocracy, gentry, and wealthy fundholder, by opposing a general property-tax, escape it.

In numberless instances the landlords could not raise the rents so as to repay themselves the amount paid in rates for their tenants. Already their liability to the constant expense of repairs, the allowance to agents for receiving the rents, the expense of insurance against fire, and the frequent loss of rents from the houses being vacant, or the inability of the tenants to pay, more particularly in manufacturing towns, where trade fluctuates, and is occasionally very bad, all conduce to render this kind of property but little desirable; and if in addition to such losses and expenses *this* burthen be added, it would have the effect of an arbitrary and tyrannical depreciation of his property, which few circumstances could justify, and which certainly the present measure of a general reformation and improvement of the *poors'-laws* would not. In innumerable instances it would occasion merely the ruin of this species of property, or drive it out of the possession of the more respectable landlords into the hands of those to whom the oppression of the poor tenant would alone make it beneficial.

Supposing the tenants, or working class, to bear the ultimate burthen, their situation would, in the generality of cases, be this: the owner being assessed, would, in letting his house, consider the payments he would be liable to, and fix the rent accordingly, the tenant must agree to pay such rent or be houseless. The landlord might at any time (the rent in these cases being usually received weekly), without notice, take the tenant's effects under a distress for the *increased* rent, so that in reality the tenant would be liable, under the proposed measure, to a distress for *rates* (included in the increased rent) from the landlord without notice, which would place the poor occupant in a much worse situation than he is at present (independently of the rise of his rent); for now it is in the power of the magistrates, with the consent of the parish officers, to relieve the tenant from payment of the *poors'-rates*; and before a distress for the rates can be taken, a summons must be issued, thereby giving the tenant time, in case he does not intend to apply to the magistrates to be relieved, to get together his money to pay the rate.

It is true, that an act was some years since passed, imposing the *poors'-rates* upon the landlords of small houses, but circumstances have prevented its coming



into general operation; and whether considered as an unjust and oppressive, or an insufficient act, it ought no longer to remain on the Statute Book, nor the principle it contained be continued in a measure of general amendment and relief.

If the rate be assessed upon these poor tenants, what will it avail? and why subject the overseers to the cruel task of distressing them for it?

Surely it never can be *gravely* argued that such gross injustice to the landlord, or barbarity to the tenant, can be justified by the scarcely doubtful *theory*, that the enforcing the payment of the rate by all, prevents improper application for relief, by the unpopularity of the attempt to increase a burthen, in which all immediately participate?

In a general measure of reform and amendment of the *poors'-laws*, the questions then arise: why should the *industrious* poor, who by their utmost exertions can rarely provide more than the mere necessities of life for themselves and families, be made either directly or indirectly to contribute to the *poors'-rates at all*? Or why should *houses* under 10*l.* per annum *rent, or actual value, be rated*? If the minimum of rating were taken at that amount (the qualification of an Elector under the Reform Act), the lower class would be *relieved* instead of oppressed; the rating of the *tenant* (and not the landlord), might be consistent throughout, from 10*l.* rent, or value and upwards, including all who are contemplated under the Reform Act, as contributing to taxation, and having a stake in the kingdom, the anomaly of rating the *landlord*, of the least valuable kind of property too, and the injustice to that class of landlords be avoided, and no class of persons could with justice complain.

There can be no doubt, that without subjecting the lower class to the *poors'-rates*, they may be rendered infinitely less burthensome to the other classes of the population, by salutary changes in the law—by the union of several parishes, having an incorporated workhouse—by a more discriminative, economical, and efficient system of relief—by the due employment and instruction of the poor, and by other means which will probably be now adopted.

The Legislature have it now in their power to grant such a boon to the *industrious* poor, as they cannot again soon have. Let them avail themselves of the opportunity afforded them, and prove that they are sincere in their desire to render taxation equal and impartial, and also to relieve, to the utmost, the lower class, and not disgrace their intended act by a measure partaking so much of spoliation and inhumanity.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

A REFORMER.

#### OPINIONS AS TO THE BANEFUL EFFECTS OF INTEMPERANCE IN IRELAND.

SIR,

*Sainfield, Ireland, April 1, 1834.*

In common with the other decided enemies of drunkenness in this country, I have been much gratified to hear of your Motion for a Committee of Inquiry on this crying evil. As a Minister of the Gospel, and one who has made considerable exertion in the cause of Temperance, especially in the counties of Down and Antrim, I have had constant opportunities of learning the effects of ardent spirits in every profession and circle in society; and I have no doubt that I express the sentiment of the great mass of the sober and enlightened part of the community, when I say, that there is **THE MOST URGENT AND PRESSING NECESSITY** for at least such an inquiry as I understand you have moved for. The opinion is rapidly gaining ground in this part of the kingdom, that distilled spirit, as was declared by a witness before the Committee on the Observance of the Sabbath, is "*the worst enemy of the British Constitution*;" and that the whole trade in it is what the first legislators of the United States have pronounced it, "**AN IMMORAL TRAFFIC**." The friends of Temperance are therefore exceedingly anxious that you should persevere in your laudable object; and should you take the high ground which truth will warrant you to take, you may calculate on their determined support as far as I acquainted with them.

With earnest wishes for the success of your undertaking, I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

WALTER MOFFAT.

## EVILS OF INTEMPERANCE—AND NECESSITY OF LEGISLATIVE MEASURES FOR ITS CORRECTION.

SIR,

North Wales, April, 1834.

From my connection with the Temperance Society, I could not be indifferent to the motion of which you have given notice relative to Drunkenness. The question is certainly one of great national importance, not only as it affects the peace of the Community, but the wealth and the prosperity of the nation. It has been calculated that the sum of twenty millions sterling is annually expended in the consumption of ardent spirits, though I cannot vouch for the strict accuracy of this calculation; but say that it is only fifteen millions, you may safely add as much more for the *abuse* of other liquors; and a sum might be thus made up nearly equal to the interest of the National Debt.

All this money expended in Intemperance is worse than wasted. It is laid out to bring in a revenue of pauperism and crime. Sir Matthew Hale said, that in his day four-fifths of the offences committed were attributable to Intemperance. Calculations have been made showing that three-fourths of the pauperism, half the insanity, and a large proportion of desertions from the Army, of cases of imprisonment for debt, and consequently of bankruptcy, may be referred to this cause. Intemperance, when viewed in its present awful extent, has a fearful effect, not only in destroying the morals, *but in dissipating the wealth of a state.* And the evil has attained to such an alarming height among us, as to call for the serious consideration of the legislature. Any relief from the House of Commons, either by the remission of taxes, or in any other way, will be perfectly unavailing as long as this frightful evil is suffered to oppress and impoverish the country. All the relief which the Legislature can afford will be lost and swallowed up when thrown into the whirlpool of Intemperance. And after all, the taxes imposed by the State shrink into absolute insignificance when compared with the exactions of Intemperance.

The question also affects the peace of the community. The burning of Bristol was the work of a few drunken individuals. I have heard that the choice wines which were plundered from the cellar of the Mayor were sold for the merest trifle, and the money applied to the purchase of gin. In 1780, the mob which set fire to Newgate, had broken open a gin-shop on Snow Hill. Those places now called gin palaces have become so glaring in London as to attract general observation. But the practise of spirit drinking is also creeping on in the country. In provincial towns "drain-shops," as they are called, may now be seen where I recollect there was nothing of the kind. With regard to London, the number has been so prodigiously increased, and licenses seemed to be obtained with so much facility that the first thing should be to *restrict the power of granting these licenses.* I can see no reason or necessity for such a place as a mere retail spirit-shop. Inns, or public-houses, may be required to a certain degree. But the number of these at present is excessive, and the only way to reduce them would be by decimating them, or shutting them up as they become vacant, and putting a stop to all fresh licenses. But the evil is so deeply seated, that the only effectual remedy must be by recurrence to the ancient laws, I think under Edward the Sixth, and Elizabeth, by which public-houses were instituted and regulated by strict enactments, to prevent tipping. The nuisance of the casual passing dram-drinker, is only part of the evil. There is another and perhaps more injurious branch of it, in the palour company, or in the evening parties, consisting of mechanics, who collect together to the number of forty or fifty at a time, leaving their families, and wasting their time and their money in a most shameful manner. However, the first proceeding in Parliament will be, I apprehend, to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the evil. You will, I presume, wish that your motion should be supported by petitions. Now it appears very opportune that by the operations of the Temperance Society, an ample machinery has been prepared for your purpose, and friends to your object raised up in every part of the country. The number of Temperance Societies in England only is, I think, between three and four hundred: and from all of these I am persuaded you will receive very cordial support.

I have the honour to be, your obedient humble servant,

A FRIEND TO TEMPERANCE.

## STRIKING ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE CRYING NECESSITY FOR AN IMMEDIATE CHURCH REFORM.

SIR,

*Cobridge, Staffordshire, April, 1834.*

As the subject of Reform in Church and Tithes will most likely be brought before Parliament very soon, I feel I should not discharge my duty if I withhold the subjoined narrative of facts, furnishing, as I believe, one of the strongest cases in favour of an immediate Reform. I have diligently searched the Scriptures, without finding any warranty for the sale of Church Livings; and to this too general abuse may fairly be attributed the number of improper persons who have purchased their way into the Sanctuary, and thereby polluted the Holy of Holies.

Church Livings were given to Laymen IN TRUST, that they might make free gifts in their respective districts, to pious and charitable Divines, who were prepared to devote their whole time to Preaching the Gospel, Visiting the Sick, and administering Consolation and Relief to all objects of Charity and Benevolence.

I remain, Sir, your obedient humble servant,

RALPH STEVENSON.

The Rectory of Stoke-upon-Trent, up to the year 1807, comprised about 20,000 acres of land, divided as we shall state directly, and which produced from 1200*l.* to 1500*l.* per annum. The valuation of tithes had been made by Mr. Pearce, and was so moderate as to give general satisfaction.

The moduses, Easter dues, and other small tithes, were only partially collected and were so trifling in amount, as to be merely an acknowledgment, and that only from the larger farms.

The following was the division of the Rectory :

The parish church of Stoke stands nearly in the centre of the potteries.

The parish church of Burslem, 4 miles north of Stoke.

....	....	Norton	5	....	north-east.
....	....	Newcastle	2½	....	west.
....	....	Whitmore	6	....	ditto.
....	Chapels—	Bucknall	3½	....	north-east.
....	....	Bagnall	6	....	ditto.

The duties at these churches and chapels were performed by six curates, the rector, the Rev. W. Robinson, residing at his other living of Swinnerton (about eight miles from Stoke), which was sold after his death to the Rev. — Dodsley, for about 12,000*l.* This reverend gentleman has raised the tithes\* from about 800*l.* a year to about 2500*l.*

In the Parliamentary Session of 1807, an act was introduced for dividing Stoke into six rectories, and selling the livings, so as to raise 7500*l.*, to invest as the settlement of Mrs. Robinson, daughter of the Dean Woodhouse of Lichfield.

This project alarmed the inhabitants, who held a public meeting, and appointed a committee for taking measures to prevent its passing into a law.

A deputation from the committee, with Mr. Tomlinson, their solicitor, went to London to oppose the bill in both houses : in doing this they expended upwards of 500*l.* The following were the reasons Mr. Tomlinson urged against the bill.

“As it is of importance to the cause of the Established Church, in these populous and daily increasing districts, that all grounds of litigation upon the questions between the respective ministers and the parishioners should, under new arrangements, be guarded against as much as possible; and it being probable that the division of the rectory into several distinct rectories for sale will lead to vexatious questions and exactions, it is proposed,

“That immediately on such separation taking place, all the great tithes shall be put on a corn rent, in each rectory, reviseable by appeal to the quarter sessions every seven, ten, or fourteen years, as may be fixed at the option of the rectors of the parishes; that all small tithes, moduses, and other compositions and payments shall remain on the same footing in every respect as within sixty years previous to the incumbency of the present rector; and that the

prevailing usage within that period shall henceforth govern in all cases of small tithes, moduses, composition, and payments.

"It is believed that clauses to this effect would operate as a bill of peace, and be the most certain means of promoting the cause of the Established Church in a rising manufacturing district, where sectaries abound.

"It must be obvious that measures which produce dissatisfaction and discontent in a parish cannot be calculated to promote its religion; and that to obtain so desirable an object, any changes which are proposed to be made in ancient establishments should be rendered palatable to the parishioners; but without some modification of the present bill, that cannot be the case."

The efforts of the parishioners were unavailing. The bill passed into a law in 1807, and the five small livings were advertised and sold on the following, as were considered, very moderate terms:

1. Burslem	about 3000 acres	} Sold for about 2000 <i>l.</i> each.
2. Newcastle	2 00 do.	
3. Whitmore	2000 do.	
4. Norton	2000 do.	
5. Bucknall and Bagnall	4000 do.	

No. 1. A curate does the duty; the rector residing within a few miles of another living, about fourteen miles from Burslem.

No. 2. The rector resides.

No. 3. The rector has been absent for some years.

No. 4. The rector resides.

No. 5. The rector resides near his living of Cheddleton, six miles distant, but performs single duty at Bagnall, and keeps a curate to do the same at Bucknall, The curate, however, as well as the rector, resides six miles off.

It was not until about 1817 that the rectory of Stoke was bargained for and sold by the very Rev. the Dean Woodhouse of Lichfield, to Mr. Tomlinson. The sum paid for it was from ten to twelve thousand pounds, with some arrangements for certain payments to the Dean for life, to the amount of about a thousand a year. The purchaser demanded upon all lands 10*s.* and 20*s.* per acre per year, as a composition; and where this was refused, he demanded payment for corn, hay, clover, vetches, agistment, milk, wool, lambs, pigs, poultry, eggs, and, in fact, for every thing that could be rendered titheable: and these claims were in many cases enforced without regard to the moduses or compositions which had been acted upon by his predecessors.

The consequence of this was a numerous meeting of the landowners at Newcastle, when they resolved upon taking legal advice, and accordingly appointed Messrs. Fentons, of Newcastle, their solicitors, with instructions to take the opinion of Mr. (now Sir Charles) Wetherell, upon the terrier of tithes, moduses, &c., in the rectory.

The opinion was favourable to the resistance of several of Mr. Tomlinson's claims, particularly as to moduses for hay, milk, &c. A subscription was set on foot to try the various questions in dispute, and among the contributors were the Marquis of Stafford, Sir J. F. Boughiey, Walter Sneyd, of Keel, Esq., Thomas Swinnerton, of Butterson, Esq., Sir J. C. Heathcote, Longton, J. Hales, of Cobridge, Esq., J. Wedgwood, of Maer, Esq.

This show of resistance induced the impropiator to threaten, and eventually to take, proceedings against some hundreds of farmers and cottagers. Many of them resisted with success, and some compromised to get rid of the expensive and vexatious proceedings continued from year to year.

About the year 1821, the impropiator made an attempt to procure an Act of Parliament to sell his tithes; but this was opposed, on the parishioners insisting that before the act was granted, an agreement should be made as to the actual value of the tithes, and as to whether the ancient moduses for hay, and milk, and small tithes, were to remain in force. To this he would not consent, and the act was abandoned. Hostile proceedings, however, were carried on, and neighbouring rectors began to enforce the same rigorous system of collecting.

The death of Sir J. Boughiey, one of the members for the county, and of W.

Kinnersly, Esq., M.P. for Newcastle, both powerful opponents of the ecclesiastical demands, took place in 1824, soon after which the patron made demonstrations for going again to Parliament, and succeeded, in 1827, in obtaining his act, though opposed by the parishioners. Under this act, nearly one-half the tithes have been already sold, at not less, upon an average, than 12*l.* or 14*l.* per acre; and if the same price is obtained for the remainder, it will produce the enormous sum of 90,000*l.*, or 4500*l.* per year, instead of 500*l.* or 600*l.*, as in 1806. Exclusive of this, the impropiator has obtained permission to grant building leases upon about seventy or eighty acres of glebe land, in Stoke-upon-Trent; and further, the Commissioners for Building New Churches have consented to the pulling down of the mother church of Stoke, and the rebuilding of it on a large and expensive scale, at the cost to the parish of several thousand pounds, as well as a good slice of the million and a half voted by Parliament. They have also agreed to the erection of two new churches at Shelton and Lane End, in the same parish.\* Thus three churches have been built, which, with the sites and burying-ground, have cost the public more than 20,000*l.* Two remain to be consecrated, at an expense of 150*l.* The moment the most Reverend Father in God, the Bishop, has pronounced his benediction, the highest bidder becomes the purchaser! What a solemn mockery upon so sacred a subject, thus converting the House of God into the temple of the money-changers!

Did the members of the Commons, when they voted a million and a half of the public money for building churches, ever contemplate that they were to be sold to the highest bidders? This is called preserving the Church and our holy religion: but one case of this description, in each county or district, would do more to open the eyes of the people, as to the real character of the Church and the Tithe system, than all that has been written upon the subject.

#### REMEDIES.

The payment of an annual rent per acre for Tithes, according to the rent of the farm—pluralities abolished—residence enforced—a more equal distribution of Church property among the clergy—the sale of livings put an immediate stop to—the charges for vaults, tombs, or monuments, to be fixed, and placed at the disposal of the wardens, instead of being arbitrary, and put into the pockets of the rector.

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The demands on our space still exceed our power of complying with them. The following communications of Correspondents will, however, we hope, appear in our Next.

“Instance of the Fatal Effects of Impressment.”—R. T. H.

“Aristocracy of Wealth, and Despotism of Superiors over Subordinates.”—H.

“Important Analysis of the Connexion of Crime with Intemperance.”—R. K. Greville.

“Origin of British Temperance Societies.”

“Effects of Habitual Drunkenness on Families in the Higher and Middle Classes.”

“Interest of Tradesmen, as Overseers, in Increasing the Poor Rates.”

---

\* In the newspapers of the day, and also in *Blackwood's Magazine*, for 1828 or 1829, these new churches will be found advertised for sale, and that years before a stone of them was laid. They were to be endowed by the patron out of the sale of the tithes, at his own valuation. The new church in Burslem has a congregation not exceeding 250, though capable of accommodating 2000. These facts furnish another instance in which the tithes, originally granted for paying the working clergy, for the building and repairing of churches, and, above all, for the maintenance of the poor and distressed, have been converted into an instrument of jobbing and speculation, by which individuals have acquired large fortunes out of the funds designed for purposes of religion and charity.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1834.

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF ENGLAND—GERMANY—  
BELGIUM—GREECE—RUSSIA—TURKEY.

IN our last Number we were obliged to break off, somewhat abruptly, from the consideration of the subject which then engaged our pen—namely, the Present State and Condition of Europe—and terminated our remarks at that stage of the inquiry which related to the Prussian league against the manufactures of Great Britain. In continuing the same train of investigation into the existing relations of the several European states with each other, and with our own, we resume our observations at the point at which they were broken off.

Saxony, which so long stood out against the Prussian league before adverted to, has now (to the great discontent of her manufacturing people) sent in her adhesion to the Cabinet of Berlin. This state measure may chafe the Saxons into a more serious revolt than that which was suppressed in the spring of 1831. A people almost wholly composed of religious Protestants, feel the support of the Catholic Church, for the use of a Catholic monarch, and about one-sixth of his subjects, to be a great and crying grievance. The support of this Papistical Establishment at Dresden amounts to 102,000 thalers. If the whole of Saxony were Catholics, and the State were foolish enough to pay the Catholic clergy on this scale of allowance, three times the present revenue of the country would not suffice for the Roman Church alone. The Lutheran, or National Church, costs but 15,000 thalers, and of this but 6,000 are furnished by the Government. Can a kingdom, with such a grievance as this, long remain in its present state? It is very nearly the case of Ireland reversed.—Substitute Ireland for Saxony, and Protestant Church for Catholic, and the difference is not very great. The King of Saxony is an amiable old bigot, and is therefore suffered to draw out his life in peace; but if the Regent, John (who has lately conformed to the Lutheran Church) do not make great and fundamental alterations, his right to the throne will not be worth a “pin’s purchase” in a few months after his coronation.

The internal administration of Saxony, though greatly in advance of that of Austria, Bavaria, and Baden, is still immeasurably inferior to that of Prussia. In respect of internal administration, Prussia is the

most admirably organized government in or out of Europe; though a military monarchy—merit, not family interest, is the grand recommendation in her army. The Prussian soldiers are, the best informed in Europe. There is not a man among them who cannot read and write, and the very lowest private knows something of music, and has been taught by the ill paid and hardy working Lutheran Clergy, the principles of his religion. Should the *Preussische soldaten* be a Catholic of Silesia, or Paderborn, you may be sure that he is greatly in advance of the Boetian Popery of the Austrian and Bavarian. It is highly to the credit of Frederick William, that he supplies to Silesia, at the expense of the State, a corps of Catholic Pastors among the most enlightened of Germany. His liberality has not stopped here; for he has also presented them with a ready built church, in the best part of Berlin, and in the Concordat signed and negotiated with the Pope, by Prince Hardenberg, this able minister, who confiscated all ecclesiastical property for the good of the State, and appropriated it to the payment of the debt provided for a large landed endowment—(and this be it observed, in a country *Kat und Luth.* Lutheran) of several Catholic Bishoprics.\* The rate payers in London, Westminster, Middlesex, and Marylebone, should also know that a noble in Prussia (before the time of Hardenberg exempt from all taxation) is now obliged to pay his fair quota. If the Duke of Northumberland transported his Charing Cross mansion to Berlin, his *herzog* would be obliged to pay about 150 times as much as the small teaman, his next door neighbour, and 200 times as much as his tenant, Mr. Coles, the eminent trussmaker, so ingeniously, and we have no doubt, so deservingly, lauded by the honourable member for Oldham.

Much has been said by public writers in England, about the breaches of faith committed by German sovereigns, in not giving their subjects a Constitution, and none is more abused on this head than the King of Prussia. But the Prussians themselves have never been agreed on this subject. One section of them was for a military monarchy—another for the glories of the middle ages and the *Nibelungen lied*; and to speak the truth, the language of the Confederation itself was on the subject of a Constitution most vague and unmeaning. These are the original words. "*In allen bundess staaten wird eine landständische verfassung staatfinden,*" which may be thus rendered "A Constitution of States will find place in every part of the Union." The word Constitution of States is so vague that it may mean anything; nay, even the feudal assemblies of ancient times. This interpretation has been seized on by the wily Metternich, and accordingly the Austrian Government have considered the "condition of the bond" fulfilled by the calling together of the feudal states, which assemble one day in the year, to vote the taxes, and assent to the budget of the Finance Minister. If Germany (and here we mean by Germany only Austria and Prussia) desire real Representative assemblies—with a fervid and ardent longing—which, by the way, we very much doubt—she must wait for these institutions till the period of a general breaking up of the present Political System of Europe.

\* Such of our readers as wish further information on the Administration of Prince Hardenberg would do well to consult a German work, entitled *Die Verwaltung des Staats Kanzlers Fürsten von Hardenberg, Leipzig, 1821.*

The personal rights of the subject have less advanced in Austria than in any other part of Germany, yet perhaps there is no country in Europe in which the peasantry are so well fed and housed. Though personal servitude still exists in Hungary, Bohemia, and Moravia—though the *bauer* is in these appendages of the Austrian Crown attached to the soil, and pays the taxes from which his lord and master is exempt—yet is he indemnified by a state of “blissful ignorance,” for the hardship of a lot to him unknown. His worldly wants are gratified when you can say to him—

“Edisti satis lusisti atque bibisti.”

And he dreams not at all of a *Staats Verfassung*,\* *Die Freiheit*,† or *Einigkeit*,‡ the magic words (according to the most enlightened) for the regeneration of his country. This is more particularly true of Austria Proper, for in Moravia and Hungary there are many troubled spirits who only want a leader to cause their discontents to flow in full diapason, but in the Duchy of Austria, the mildness of the Government—the easy and happy temper of the people—and a long habit of obedience and submission to constituted authorities, as well as a full confidence in the paternal kindness of the Emperor—whom the natives call their Franzel (little Francis) render the tasks of Government and obedience equally easy. A general torpidity of mind and body prevails in these states. In the Austrian empire comprising (Italy included) a population of nearly 25 millions, there are not much above 25 newspapers, and in Vienna itself there are only two Journals in the German tongue.

That the Austrian people are the most anti-revolutionary in Europe is apparent, from their immobility under the great Monetary Revolution, which reduced the *Schuldscheine*, or Government notes, two-fifths in value. A measure inflicting ruin on thousands, was submitted to as cheerfully as though it had brought healing on its wings. Nor is this perhaps so wonderful, when we reflect that though the forms of the Austrian Government may be despotic, yet the actual administration is not personally oppressive. Many things now solidly established in Austria, depend upon the precarious life of the present Emperor. Were the almost idiotic King of Hungary to ascend the throne, or the Archduke Charles to become Regent, it is not easy to predicate what might take place in Hungary, Moravia, and the Lombardo Venetian kingdom.

Our diplomacy at Vienna has been for a long time greatly at fault. Why had not Great Britain influence enough to induce Austria to join in the Gallo British Reclamations against the late Russo Turkish Treaty?—Why is it that M. Tatischeff lords it over “the Percy and the Douglas both together.” These are questions which a Reformed Parliament should ask. Whether Lord Palmerston will be able to give a reason for the faith that is in him or out of him is quite another question.

Of Bavaria we have not much to say. In 1820 the Bavarian and Baden Governments honourably distinguished themselves by successfully resisting the attempt made at the ministerial conferences at Vienna, to prohibit the publication of the debates of the States; but



since then her half-demented King has thrown himself into the arms of Austria and Prussia. Wallerstein and Schenk are now his favourites, while the Count Armandberg, the ablest and most liberal man in his dominions (with the exception of the *Octogenaire* Montgelas), is sent to Greece, where, notwithstanding, Russian intrigue is working its tortuous and slimy way. In Rhenish Bavaria there is great discontent, and on the first great European convulsion, Louis (if he be not previously consigned to the *Hopital des Fous*), may find himself without a kingdom to misgovern, and no generalship in the French army (in which his father served), to fall back on.

The constitution of Baden is more favourable to popular rights than that of Bavaria. In the former Grand Duchy every individual of mature age is entitled to vote in the choice of Deputies. The popular will is sufficiently indicated by the sending of such men as Welcker, Rotteck, and Duttlinger, to the Chambers. The present Grand Duke (the descendant of a Morganatic marriage), ascended the throne in 1830, and if he govern in the interest of his subjects, he may laugh at the claims of Louis of Bavaria to the district of Sponheim.

We know not whether Lord Erskine, who has some four or five thousand a-year for doing nothing at the Bavarian Court, keeps Lord Palmerston *au courant* of these little regal disputes. Perhaps not, for we never heard that his Lordship was very profound in the *Jus Gentium*—certain it is that our brethren across the Atlantic did not think him so.

The Wurtemberg Constitution was the first that appeared in the avowed shape of a social contract. The resistance of the nobles to the Constitution of Wurtemberg, by reducing the States to one assembly, gave to it a more democratic character.

We have dwelt so much on Germany that we have not leisure or space to go into a consideration of the smaller states. The eyes of Europe, and of Britain in particular, should be turned at this moment to the Congress which is sitting at Vienna. Measures of repression as to the press are no doubt meditated, perhaps matured in the Austrian capital; and, doubtless, it is meant *en revanche* to correct all glaring administrative abuses, and, in the event of resistance, to swallow up the smaller States. This may be done with impunity, for the German is naturally impassible and patient, and a loather of France and French principles—but the question here is of European, not German interests. Yet, we believe, Sir Frederick Lamb is in the very season of the Congress amusing himself in a warmer climate on the other side of the Alps.

Although the ancient simplicity of Swiss manners have been a good deal modified by time, and a constant intercourse with the distinguished strangers of all nations, who seek a temporary abode among her mountains and her plains, nevertheless the Swiss have preserved more of the primitiveness of their ancestors than any other people, excepting always the Friezlanders and Norwegians. Escaped from the feudality of the middle ages, by the glorious results of the battle of Morgarten, Switzerland formed that confederation of thirteen Cantons, which exists to the present day. Hitherto no nation has shown itself more worthy of liberty than the Swiss. The wisdom, the moderation, and the tolerance of their provincial governments, have, with perhaps

two exceptions, been worthy the highest praise. We allude to the governments of Berne and Fribourg. The principle of aristocracy at Berne was carried to a baleful length. It was not a passive but an aggressive and grasping aristocratic spirit under the worst form. It was this spirit which dictated the attempt to recover the Pays de Vaud and Argovia at the Congress of Vienna, and failing in this to deprive those Cantons of the independence which they had acquired by solemn treaties.\* The overthrow of the aristocratic governments of Berne has now happily taken place, and since their fall, the people are fully aware of the proceedings of the secret council which formerly existed. The application of the secret funds, and the instructions given to M. M. Zeerleder and Haller are also known to the popular party, and it may be supposed they will turn this knowledge to good account. In Fribourg the obnoxious spirit was a bigotted Catholic spirit, destructive of all municipal and social improvement. We fear this spirit is not yet at an end, for it is more difficult to extirpate, and far more dangerous than the aristocratic spirit itself.

We wish we could say that Switzerland was tranquil, but we fear it is far from being so. The disputes between the town and country people still continue, and Basil is far from being in a state of repose. We believe that M. Rumigny, the French Minister (of whose personal worth and ability we may speak, from a knowledge of the man), exerted himself laudably and wisely to settle these domestic differences. We say wisely, for unless they be soon settled, Austrian and Prussian troops will occupy Switzerland.

We have been informed that Mr. Morier, the British Minister, accredited to the Cantons, is far more zealous for the propagation of his own peculiar religious tenets, than for the interests and ascendancy of England; but we suppose Lord Palmerston will justify his appointment, in consequence of the salary of 1000*l.* a-year, caused by the suppression of the Consul-Generalship at Paris, a post which M. Morier formerly held.

Of Sweden and Denmark we have left ourselves little room to speak in detail. Denmark is equally passive in its foreign and domestic policy. As a punishment for her weakness and her misfortunes, she was despoiled of half her territory by the Congress of Vienna, in order that Sweden might obtain an indemnity for the loss of Finland. "The Danish monarch," says the witty Prince de Linge, "won all *hearts* at the Viennese Congress, but, notwithstanding, he went away robbed of some thousand of *souls*." England should not have permitted Russia to perpetrate a double robbery on this occasion; first, by plundering Sweden of Finland, without a pretence of a claim; and secondly, by plundering Denmark of Norway to indemnify Sweden.

An intimate alliance and special treaty might now be negotiated by England with Denmark and Sweden, so as to counteract the commercial schemes of Prussia, but we have little hope of any attempt being made just now. Our Ministers have exhibited a *crassa ignorantia*, as regards foreign affairs. Of revolutions in Denmark there need be no dread. One fine morning in 1660, the Danes made a donation of their lives and properties to their sovereign. They added to this deed

---

\* Vide de Flassan Histoire du Congrès de Vienne.

of gift, a memorandum to the effect that if the kings of *any* country had *any* privilege which was not comprised in their act, they granted such privilege beforehand, and at all risk to their monarchs ! Is this a people likely to be smitten by the propagand ?

Sweden, though a second or third rate power, is peopled by one of the noblest branches of the German race. It has been not less truly than profoundly observed by Madame de Staël, " that the proximity of a people to the sea excites ideas of independence." Men feel the necessity of braving the ocean, and commerce and civilization reward their enterprise. The nations inhabiting the shores of the Baltic, founded institutions which reserved power to *classes*, but in no one instance favoured despotism. The remains of this comparative freedom exists in Norway and Sweden to the present day, in the Diets and Storthings, and the peasant of Dalecarlia feels that he has as good if not a better right to his ancient liberties than Charles John to his throne. The present monarch of Sweden, worthy of comparison with Gustavus Vasa and Adolphus, is deservedly popular, but it were difficult to say what may take place in the interesting country which he governs, when he shall be no more. The Crown Prince, Oscar, is supposed to be in the interest of Russia, and the Swedish peasantry abhor the idea of Muscovite alliance or friendship.

The transferences of a whole people, practised on so large a scale by the Vienna Congress, have not in every instance succeeded. As yet, Finland is linked to Russia, and Norway to Sweden, but a day may come when they shall emulate the example of the Netherlands. This is but reciprocity. When emperors take into their heads to dispose of nations without consulting them, nations may also take up the whim of disposing of kings at their will and pleasure too.

With the 17th century the most brilliant epoch in the history of Holland passed away. Her vessels then ploughed every sea—her merchants trafficked with every country. Her commerce was at once on the grandest and smallest scale. She possessed subjects who would freight " an argosie" with millions, combined with a sort of costermonger merchants, who would journey far and near to make one stiver more. *Tout pour la tripe et rien pour l'amour*, became the Urim and Thummin of this tribe. They disposed of their wares to all customers, friends and enemies, where there was a penny to make. They sold to Louis XIV. the very powder with which he destroyed their towns ; and a French author of that day, speaking of this rage for gold, relates a characteristic reply of a Dutchman to the Stadtholder: "*S'il y avait quelque bénéfice à faire avec l'Enfer, j'irais y, bruler mes voiles,*" said this worthy dealer and chapman. It requires all the glory of Erasmus, Huygens, and Boerhaave, to wipe out such a national taint as this. In truth the mammon-loving spirit is now disclosing its fruits. A people, who are so intent on the object of gain as to intrust its internal and external defence to an army of Swiss and German mercenaries, must soon sink in the scale of nations. Temple foresaw and predicted that this would be the fate of Holland. The Dutch flag no longer waves proudly in both hemispheres—Belgium is now severed from the sway of King William, and never will his ships essay to burn an English fleet in the chops of the British channel. Even the literary glory of the United Provinces is gone by, and Leyden, once so famous, is now

deserted. Such is the present state of Holland, and it is not difficult to foresee that her population and commerce will go on decreasing, till at length her limited means will oblige her to have recourse to a simple and less expensive government than that of a king. Holland will, ere long, be ruled by a chief, bearing the more ancient but not less honourable title of Stattholder.

The annexation of Belgium to Holland, at the Congress of Vienna, was considered by most of the leading statesmen and political writers of that day (and among others by the Ex-Bishop of Malines, one of the most zealous, if not the ablest commentator on the proceedings of that body), as one of the wisest measures adopted by the Powers, and it certainly was the most feasible and expedient that could be then hit on. To British industry it was deemed an arrangement particularly favourable; and if it did not completely answer the end and object contemplated by the famous Barrier Treaty, the fault did not lie with the King of Holland, still less with the British Plenipotentiary, Lord Castlereagh. We do not mean here to write a history of the Belgian Revolt, or to palliate the conduct of the King of Holland; all we mean to say is, that commercially speaking, the separation has not been so injurious to British interests as might at first sight appear. The imports into London from Belgium and Holland in 1830, amounted to 1,168,000*l.*, and from Holland alone in 1831, to 843,000*l.* The exports from London to Belgium and Holland in 1830, amounted to 1,512,000*l.*, from London to Holland alone in 1831, to 1,220,000*l.* The duty paid on butter and cheese in London, imported from Holland in 1831, exceeds 110,000*l.*

From Newcastle and Sutherland, several hundred cargoes of coals have been exported to Holland in 1831; while previous to the separation, heavy duties existed on English coals for the encouragement of the English coal-mines. How the separation may operate politically, as regards not alone England, but the balance of power in Europe, is a question which can only be solved by the greatest of all seers, Time; and it will be solved in the first European war; but at present we look on Belgium as an interesting experiment on the principle of popular sovereignty, and we wish the attempt all success. To the admirers of cheap government, it is, no doubt, a pleasing sight to see a Cabinet Minister receiving only a salary of 800*l.* a-year. This must gladden the heart of Mr. Hume; but there are, nevertheless, two sides to this question, and we are by no means sure that it is not wiser to err rather on the side of liberality than parsimony. The result of this niggard system will, by-and-bye, tend to throw the Government of Belgium into the hands exclusively of wealthy men; for even in the Low Countries, a notoriously cheap kingdom—800*l.* a-year is not sufficient for a Cabinet Minister. Indeed this system is beginning already to work ill, for the two ablest men that the Revolution of Belgium has produced, have refused to enter into the Cabinet, alleging that their means do not permit them to do so. *Messieurs* Van de Weyer, and Le Hon, prefer remaining at London and Paris, where they have a salary treble that of a Cabinet Minister, rather than accept the higher and more ill-paid office at home. The result is, that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was first given to General Goblet, who retained his Military pay and Staff appointment, and next to the Count

Felix de Merode, who is so rich, that he refused the paltry salary attached to the office. The Belgians may compliment either of these gentlemen on their patriotism, but it would be carrying servility too far to compliment them on their ability or fitness for their station.

Our Minister at Brussels is a veteran in the service, but age does not always bring in its train increase of wisdom. Sir Robert Adair is undoubtedly a man of parts, quickness, and some genius. The fact of his having repeated the Lord's Prayer in solemn tone, before the Turkish Divan, when he had forgotten his cut and dry speech, on his reception by the Grand Signor, is a proof of this latter quality, for the device succeeded admirably, as they did not understand one word of it; but he is now nearly outworn, and he should give place to a younger man.

Those demi-heroes, demi-brigands, the Greeks, so well painted by Byron, as

Callous, save to crime,  
Stain'd with each evil that pollutes  
Mankind, where least above the brutes,  
Without even savage virtue blest,  
Without one free or valiant breast,

are still in too unsettled a state for a public writer to pronounce an opinion on their probable fate: The objections to the North-Western frontier excluding a great portion of Acarnania and Etolia, still exist, rendering the kingdom insecure in a geographical position, and still more insecure perhaps, by the prevalence of Russian intrigues. It is a curious feature in Russian state tactics, that at the very moment she was urging an Ultra-Monarchical interference in the case of Spain, she was openly exciting a Democratic revolt in Greece. The object in both instances was the same, (regardless of the means) and that object was the advancement of Russian interests, and the ultimate increase of Russian territory, by the aid of present Muscovite protection.

The Cabinet of Petersburg, is still, by the aid of Colocotroni, and others, labouring hard at these purposes, counteracted openly by Count Armansperg, one of the ministers of the young King Otho, and Mr. Dawkins, the British Resident; but when we reflect on the apathy of England and France—on the degradation and moral baseness of the Greeks themselves—on the weakness of the Regency—on the state of the Greek finances—and on that community of Religion which binds the Greek to the Muscovite, we can by no means regard the new kingdom as free from the external dangers, as it certainly is not free from internal faction and discord. The eye of England should untiringly be fixed on the proceedings of Nicholas, as regards Greece, and her arm should, if necessary, be uplifted in all its might.

We cannot pursue this subject further in our present Number, as the opening of Parliament after the recess will now demand a large portion of our space; but we will conclude our investigation by a reference to Russia and Turkey in our next.

## ABOLITION OF THE PILGRIM TAX AND PILGRIM HUNTERS IN INDIA.

MOST of our readers will remember the repeated occasions on which, both by the tongue and the pen, we have endeavoured to draw public attention towards, and arouse public indignation against, the horrid and criminal participation of the India Company in the wages of sin and the fruits of unrighteousness, by polluting themselves with the guilty profit of gains from Idolatry. Our statements were at first disbelieved. Few persons would credit any thing so monstrous as that a Christian Government should ever give its open sanction to idol-worship and human sacrifices. But when we added that they not only sanctioned but *encouraged* it—and that for the sake of its unhallowed gain—we were condemned as calumniators, and every species of vituperation was heaped upon us, for reviling, through vindictive motives alone, so *respectable* a body of persons as those composing the East India Company! We disregarded all these marks of incredulity and scorn; and being convinced of the truth and justice of our statements, we went on repeating them till nearly a million of persons had heard them not merely uttered, but proved, by evidence the most undeniable. At length the incredulity lessened—the imputation of vindictive motives faded away—the religious portion of the community, awakened to the enormity of this national sin, roused themselves to action—meetings were held—resolutions were passed—petitions were presented—candidates were questioned—representatives were pledged—and a powerful array was raised up in all parts of the kingdom, to assault the great citadel of Idolatry, and to determine on razing it to the ground.

The actual state of the case was this :—The India Company, finding that the immense numerical majority of their conquered subjects in India could only be kept in peaceable subjection to their rulers by being allowed the freest exercise of their religious opinions, however monstrous, and the fullest practice of their rites and ceremonies, however cruel and murderous—as many of them were—allowed the natives of India the most undisturbed possession of all their religious observances of every kind and description. From this, however, they passed into a support of many of their religious establishments—by paying the priests—repairing the temples—making grants or endowments, and retaining musicians, dancing girls, and others, for the ~~mausoleums~~ of the Mohammedans, and ~~pagodas~~ of the Hindoos; in legislating for the regulation of fasts and festivals, pains and penalties, among the Pagans; and deriving large profits on the taxes imposed, and fees exacted, for the performance of religious rites. This became at length so considerable a source of revenue, that the Company at length took the administration of the great Indian temple of Juggernaut.

naut into their hands; and made it so entirely a matter of gain that the Governor-General, in one of his dispatches, actually offers his congratulations to the English superintendant of the temple on the great increase of revenue received at it during the preceding year; though that increase could have arisen from no other cause than the corresponding increase in the number of pilgrims who had engaged in the worship of the great idol, from which alone this revenue was derived. Not satisfied, however, with the ordinary flow of this stream of guilty gain into their polluted coffers, the Supreme Council at Calcutta exercised their ingenuity to see whether they could not still further increase their profits from this source: and as this could only be done by increasing the amount of the fees to be paid by the pilgrims, or to augment their members; they did both. The amount of tax per head to be paid by those who entered the temple, for the privilege of worshipping the idol Juggernaut, was increased by the British Government. The idol itself was newly decked out in scarlet broad cloth, brought from the East India Company's own warehouses; his car was newly gilded and decorated at their charge; and then a body of men were organized, and trained, and instructed in all the arts of deception, for the purpose of going forth as missionaries, to preach the great additional glory of Juggernaut, now that he had been taken under the Company's protection, fed by the Company's supply of his table, clothed in the Company's scarlet robes; and the mummers, and the dancing girls, the priests, and the courtezans of the unhallowed orgies of this polluted idol, paid by an English gentleman, appointed by the Company to watch over the welfare of the whole! These missionaries, with this sanction and authority, went forth over the country, forming a body far more numerous than all the Christian missionaries throughout the East, and in order to stimulate them to the greatest exertions in their nefarious pursuit, the Company's superintendant was ordered to pay them by a commission on their success, or a certain sum per head for every pilgrim they could bring to the shrine. With so powerful a motive for their zeal, their exertions were both great and successful. They brought in tens of thousands, who, but for their seduction and allurements, would never have thought of coming from such distances to worship Juggernaut; and when the poor wretches were thus deluded to ruin, they were generally stripped of all they possessed, by the various fees and exactions levied by the Company's authority, and received by the Company's superintendant, for worshipping their wooden God under English license and permission; when not having wherewithal to sustain themselves on their homeward way, they left their dying and emaciated bodies on the plain around the temple, to be devoured by the beasts of the field, and consumed by the birds of the air; so that Dr. Claudius Buchanan says, in his *Christian Researches in India*, that the approach to Juggernaut might be known in every direction for fifty miles before you come to the temple itself, by the bleached bones of the unhappy victims that strew the plain on every side.

This was the actual state of things when we returned from India ten years ago. We did our utmost to expose it, in the pages of the *ORIENTAL HERALD*, for six successive years, in lectures, delivered in all parts of the kingdom, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, to nearly a million of

persons in the aggregate; as well as in the First Series of the PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW; and last of all in our place in the House of Commons, during the discussions of the last session on the passing of the new India Bill. To all these efforts, the constant answer was, that it would be *dangerous* to make any alteration in the existing relations between the rulers and the ruled in India; that it would endanger our empire, that a revolution of blood would follow, and that no man could foresee the end. Our rejoinder always was, "Be just, and fear not," and if partial evil should arise in effecting the change, it will be overruled to ultimate good. Still, however, the Indian authorities remained apparently as obdurate and impenetrable as adamant. All this while, however, the constant drop was perforating its way through their flinty hearts, and inflexible resolutions; and at length—that which but a year ago was declared to be so dangerous, so headlong, so impracticable, is at length proclaimed, and on the eve of taking place!

Let us hasten to relieve the impatience of our readers, by laying before them the following extracts from an Official Dispatch recently sent out to India by the Directors of the Company, for a copy of which we are indebted to a zealous friend of the Natives, the Rev. Mr. Pegg, whose admirable Work, "India's Cries to British Humanity," ought to be in every Christian's hand. The extracts from the dispatch alluded to are as follows:

Arrangements which implicate the Government, whether in a greater or less degree, in the immediate ministrations of the local superstitions of the Natives, might well be objected to, in point of principle, even without reference to their actual or probable consequences; but, that they also tend to consequences of an injurious kind is evident, inasmuch as they exhibit the British power in such intimate connexion with the unhappy and debasing superstitions in question, as almost necessarily to inspire the people with a belief, either, *that we admit the divine origin of those superstitions, or, at least, that we ascribe to them some peculiar and venerable authority.*

We conceive that the system of raising a revenue, or at least a surplus revenue, by means of a Pilgrim Tax, must in any way lead to the promotion and encouragement of the superstition out of which the Tax is derived. It gives the Government an immediate interest in the progress and extension of such superstitions. It furnishes both to the Government and to such of its functionaries as are concerned in levying the Tax, (supposing them to sympathize with their employers), *a perpetual inducement to increase the income of the Temple, and therefore to attract to the spot as numerous a concourse of Pilgrims as possible.*

We conceive that the principles of toleration do not require that we should promote the growth and popularity of superstitions, the prevalence of which every rational and religious mind must lament, and we are, therefore, of opinion, that any system which connects the pecuniary interests of the state with such superstitions, is for that reason objectionable and ought to terminate.

There can be no little doubt that the exertions of the *Pilgrim Hunters* and their employers are incited and quickened by the assurance, which the known good faith and exactness of the British Government hold out to them, that their fees will be levied and paid with scrupulous punctuality. Thus the credit and authority of the Government are perverted to the support of a manifest and revolting abuse. On the whole, we think that the Pilgrim Tax should be extinguished altogether, leaving it to the Priests to admit votaries on whatever terms they please.

In stating to you our distinct opinion respecting the abolition, not only of the Pilgrim Tax, but of the practices connected with it, or bearing a similar construction, we are rather holding up a standard to which you are ultimately to



conform your policy, than prescribing a rule which you are instantly and without respect of circumstances to carry into accomplishment. We are sensible that this is one of those subjects, respecting which it is peculiarly difficult to give, from this country, more than general instructions. As to the details of any measure regarding it—the time, the degree, the manner, the gradation, the precautions, these must in an especial sense rest with the local Government. To you, therefore, they must be consigned, and we so consign them, in perfect reliance on the experience, liberty, and judgment of our Governor-General in Council. But while we commit without hesitation into your hands the details of execution, we feel it at the same time our duty to communicate to you our general views and intentions. Finally, it may be convenient to recapitulate in a brief series the formal conclusions resulting from the preceding discussion. They are the following:

1. That the interference of British Functionaries in the interior management of Native Temples, in the customs, habits, and religious proceedings of their Priests and Attendants, in the arrangement of their ceremonies, rites, and festivals, and generally in the condition of their interior economy, shall cease.
2. That the Pilgrim Tax shall be every where abolished.
3. That fines and offerings shall no longer be considered as sources of revenue by the British Government, and they shall consequently no longer be collected, or received by the servants of the East India Company.
4. That no servant of the East India Company shall be engaged in the collection, management, or custody of monies, in the nature of fines or offerings, in whatever manner obtained, or whether furnished in cash or in kind.
5. That no servant of the East India Company shall hereafter derive any emolument resulting from the above-mentioned or any similar sources.
6. That in all measures relating to their Temples, their worship, their festivals, their religious practices, their ceremonial observances, our Native subjects be left entirely to themselves.
7. That in every case in which it has been found necessary to form and keep up a Police force, specially with a view to the peace and security of the Pilgrims or the Worshippers, such Police shall hereafter be maintained and made available out of the general revenues of the country.

Much caution and many gradations may be necessary in acting on the conclusions at which we have arrived; among other concomitant measures, such explanations should be given to the Natives as shall satisfy them, that so far from abandoning the principles of a just toleration, the British Government is resolved to apply them with more scrupulous accuracy than ever, and that, *this proceeding is in truth, no more than a recurrence to that state of neutrality from which we ought never to have departed.* Nor in enjoining only a gradual approach to the desired end, do we exclude from our view the possible expediency of commencing with some one of the great superstitious establishments, and of extending the improvement to the rest, only in the complete success of the first experiment. All this process, however, we leave to be regulated by the judgment and experience of our Governor-General in Council, who, we are persuaded, will carry our views into effect with all prudent and practicable expedition.

Signed by A. G. Ravenshaw, Esq., Chairman, and thirteen other members of the Hon. Court of Directors.

The very instrument of revocation or abolition, which this may be considered, will show what the practices were which are now ordered to be destroyed. Thank Heaven! we have now lived to see the accomplishment of nearly all the great objects for which we contended in India fifteen years ago; and for advocating which we were banished without trial from that country to plead the cause of India in this. We have seen the Trading Monopoly with China destroyed—the Settlement or Colonization of India legally authorized—the Liberty of the Indian Press established—the Burning of Widows abolished—and

the upholding of Idolatry discountenanced; for all of which we have been contending against a host for nearly twenty years.

Who would not persevere then, in a righteous cause—however persecuted, however calumniated, however plundered, however beggared for his pains? With what gift could Fortune crown any man more valuable, than to live to witness the accomplishment of all his public views? What pleasure could even a monarch bestow more sweet than that of looking back over a long course of years spent in struggling to accomplish the object now within his grasp? What acquisitions of external wealth, or temporal power, could afford such unalloyed delight, as the proud consciousness that amidst every difficulty by which he was beset—through every temptation by which he was surrounded—he calmly marched onward with the firm and steady step of virtuous resolution—turning neither to the right nor to the left—despising evil report, nor courting even good; but clad in the armour of simple truth, and having justice only for his shield, forcing his way victoriously through every obstacle, and before sinking to an honourable grave, having the garland of bloodless and guiltless victory wreathed around his brows!

#### BENEFIT OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

It is often said that foreign commerce is beneficial, because it gives employment; but that is mistaking the means for the end—the painful process which it is necessary to go through, in order to realize a good, for the good itself. It is an imported produce that is wanted, and not the necessity for labouring, and the less labour or employment that we have in getting that produce, the better. If double the quantity could be obtained in return for the same amount of British labour that is now employed in obtaining it, there can be no doubt that it would be better for the British labourers; it would be, in fact, in common language, to obtain the imports for half price.—*Hopkins' Great Britain for the Last Forty Years.*

#### WAGES AND COMBINATIONS.

Custom is a second nature, and things not originally necessary to healthful existence become so from habit. Though the Irish peasantry, living upon potatoes and butter-milk, are not subjected to greater mortality than their neighbours, yet were the labouring classes in England, brought up upon the more substantial diet of bread and cheese, and butchers' meat, reduced to the less nutritious food which use has rendered not unhealthful in Ireland, debility and disease would rapidly thin their ranks. A higher rate of mortality among the labouring classes would speedily follow the establishment of a combination for reducing wages. Where there were numerous families they would be thinned by death; the delicate and infirm would sink prematurely to the grave; and while more died, fewer would be born. The cautious and the prudent, and those who were attached to the former superior scale of comfort, would abstain from marriage, and from encumbering themselves with families; and thus, by rendering deaths more numerous and births less frequent, an effectual combination for the reduction of wages, however brief its existence, would, for a whole generation, reduce the supply of labour in relation to the demand. Nothing could now prevent the recoil of wages. An effective combination for the reduction of wages would bear within it the principle of almost immediate self-destruction; and, after a brief existence, would leave wages at a higher level than that from which they had fallen. For, the instant the combination should be broken up, increased capital accumulated at home, or imported from abroad, would be employed in cultivating the land which had been abandoned, and in supplying the renewed consumption of the necessaries of life.—*Colonel Torrens.*

## MEETING OF BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT AFTER THE EASTER RECESS.

---

ON Monday the two Houses of Parliament resumed the course of their public proceedings after the Easter Recess, and both were tolerably well attended.

In the Lords the business did not occupy much time. The English and Irish Judgements Bill, and the Equitable Apportionments Bill, both went through Committee. Lord Rosslyn, on behalf of Lord Ellenborough, who was absent, postponed the motion, of which notice had been given, as to certain claims on the King of Oude, until Friday the 2d of May. The Lord Chancellor moved for some returns relative to the balances of money connected with Chancery suits in Ireland, deposited in the Bank of that country, and gave notice of his intention to move some amendments in the Bill for holding Sessions in the Metropolis, which had been suggested by some of the Judges.

In the House of Commons it was expected by many that the Debate on the Cambridge Petition for the admission of Dissenters would have been resumed—as it will be remembered, that this debate, though it occupied three entire morning sittings, was adjourned over the holidays; but it was now simply moved that the Petition should lie upon the table, where it was placed without comment, and without opposition.

A private bill, for the paving of St. Pancras, was made the subject of a short discussion—but was thrown out on the second reading—the numbers on the division being—For the second reading, 29; Against it, 35.

Several petitions were then presented—which occupied the House till three o'clock, when the Speaker left the chair.

At five the House resumed as usual:—and in the early part of the evening, Lord Althorp stated that it was his intention to bring forward his resolution respecting Tithes, on the following evening (Tuesday), and the question of the Amendment of the Poor Laws, on Thursday.

A motion for the production of the record of the conviction of the agricultural labourers at Dorchester, made by Mr. O'Connell, was assented to; and that gentleman intimated his intention of bringing forward a distinct motion on the case of these unhappy and oppressed individuals, on Friday.

The remainder of the evening was occupied with the Miscellaneous Estimates, which elicited many remarks from various Members, but led to no formal opposition ending in divisions—so that all the votes were agreed to. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to give an *abstract* of the proceedings, every vote being so different from each other; but we present as brief a report of the whole as is compatible with clearness and intelligibility; our object being, in every case, to put our readers in the fullest possession of the most important features of Parliamentary proceedings in the shortest practicable space.

Mr. S. RICE said, that when in former years it was his duty to introduce the miscellaneous estimates to the notice of the house, he had invariably abstained from any preliminary remarks, because he thought that the effect of such discussions was generally to produce confusion, and that the best opportunity for affording whatever explanations might be required was to be found when each separate vote came before the committee. He was not now going to depart materially from his former practice, but there were one or two facts connected with those estimates which he thought would prove gratifying to the house, and therefore he should briefly call its attention to them. Under the head of "Miscellaneous Estimates" were contained five classes of expenditure,—the Treasury, Irish Miscellaneous Services, Civil Contingencies, Ordnance Extraordinaries, and Commissariat. He wished to state the result of the reductions effected during the four years that it had been his duty to propose these estimates. In the present, as compared with the past year, the saving in those estimates amounted to 234,000*l.*; as compared with 1832, it was 726,000*l.*; and in reference to 1831, it was 1,322,000*l.* (Hear, hear.) He trusted this statement would prove satisfactory. (Hear.) Endeavours had been made to limit the contingent or extraordinary votes as far as possible, considering that they might be made matter of estimate. During the last two years there was no vote for army extraordinaries. The committee would bear in mind that a saving of 1,322,000*l.* had been effected on a gross estimate of 3,346,000*l.*, a reduction of more than one-third of the whole. (Hear, hear.) The first vote he should propose was a vote that he would take out of the ordinary course, it being one that related to individuals who had a strong claim on the attention of the house—he referred to the vote for the expenses of revising barristers under the Reform Bill. Those gentlemen had rendered the services required by the act but had not yet been paid their allowances and expenses. The item in question was No. 14, and it exhibited a reduction of 8000*l.*, as compared with last year's estimate; the expense being then 30,500*l.*, instead of which it now amounted to 22,500*l.* only.

The vote of 22,500*l.* for allowances and expenses of the barristers employed in revising list of voters, &c., under the act 2 William IV., c. 45, was then agreed to.

Mr. S. RICE said that the next vote he should propose was for the cost of two pictures purchased for the use of the nation. The question of a national gallery was one that had been sought after and urged by the house rather than by the Government. He never recollected a feeling so strongly expressed upon all sides as that which prevailed in favour of a national gallery. (Hear.) It came recommended by all parties, and received the support of gentlemen most urgent for economy, and such being the case, Government had adopted the idea. During the present year two of the finest Corregios in Europe came within reach of purchase, and Government thought this an opportunity that ought not to be missed. The house might wish to know what steps had been taken by the Government in order to ascertain the value of those pictures; and he was happy, therefore, to have it in his power to state that we were purchasing them at a most reasonable rate. One single fact, indeed, which he would mention would, he had no doubt, be sufficient to satisfy the house that such was the case. They had distinct evidence to that effect before them on the part of the best judges who had inspected the pictures, and they had also distinct evidence before them that a private individual had several years ago, as mere matter of trade and speculation, offered the sum of 10,000 guineas for the same pictures. The value of those pictures, according to the opinion of the best judges, was 12,000 guineas, and the Government had been able to purchase them for the country for 500 guineas under that sum. He would mention the names of the best qualified judges, who had been selected to value those pictures, as authority for what he now stated, were it not that he was afraid a vote of this kind often produced a debate in that house that was not of a generally useful character. The house having already voted the erection of a national gallery, he trusted that it would give its cordial assent to a vote of this description for the purchase of two such noble pictures for that gallery. The hon. gentleman concluded by moving that the sum of 11,550*l.* be granted for the purchase of pictures for the National Gallery, for the year 1834.

Mr. WARBURTON said that he had no intention to oppose this vote; on the contrary, he entirely agreed in the opinion expressed by his hon. friend, that if any pictures should be purchased for the National Gallery they should be such as, like the two pictures in this instance, had obtained a high and well-known character throughout Europe. This vote, he must say, met with his cordial concurrence. (Hear, hear.) He would take that opportunity to express a wish that some information should be laid before the house with regard to the arrangements that were to be made with the Royal Academy, as respected the terms on which a certain portion of the new building was to be appropriated for their use. So far from the building now in progress being too extensive for the purposes of a national gallery, he thought that from the large donations that might from time to time be made to the National Gallery, the space already appropriated for it would soon become too small, and that all the ground would be required for it alone. He feared, in fact, that under such circumstances, though the building would be amply sufficient for a national gallery of pictures of the ancient masters, it would not be sufficient for a gallery for the Royal Academy. He wished therefore to know what terms had been made with the Royal Academy, and whether it was to be understood that the space which was to be given to the Royal Academy in the National Gallery would be given up by them, if it should be hereafter wanted for the purposes of the National Gallery itself. He thought that the Government should retain in its hands the power of taking possession of that space of ground hereafter, if it should be wanted for the National Gallery.

Mr. S. RICE was glad that such a question had been put, and he certainly had every reason to join in the anticipation of his hon. friend, that from the accumulated donations of pictures the National Gallery would, at some future period, be totally occupied by them. If any argument were required in support of this vote, he would mention a fact in illustration of the statement just made by his hon. friend—namely, that since the first purchase of pictures by the State, there had been given by private individuals to the State pictures to the value of 67,000*l*. Now, if any gentleman felt a doubt as to the propriety of the present vote, he was sure that such a fact would at once remove it, satisfactorily demonstrating, as it did, that Parliament in passing such a vote as the present merely aided the public, and afforded an incentive to private benefactions to the public treasury. His hon. friend had asked, what arrangement had been made with the Royal Academy, in respect to the rooms that were to be appropriated for them in the National Gallery? The arrangement which had been made was, he believed, such as his hon. friend would approve of—namely, that the Royal Academy should only take from the public the use of the rooms, the property in them still remaining in the public, and that if hereafter the public expediency or necessity should require the resumption of those rooms for the public use, there was nothing in the arrangement to prevent it. It was under these circumstances that the temporary use of the rooms was given to the Royal Academy, and so far from that being an inconvenience, he thought it would be a great advantage to the building to be thus at once filled with the national pictures on the one side, and the pictures of the Royal Academy on the other. The arrangement in question, he repeated, was made on the full understanding that the building was to be to all intents and purposes for the use of the National Gallery, whenever it should require the whole of it.

Sir R. PEEL wished, on this occasion, to put in a word for the Royal Academy. He did not dispute the right of the Government to deprive the Royal Academy of the apartments which they held at present in Somerset House, but he contended that if they did so they were justly bound to furnish them with an equivalent. He contended that in such a case the public was bound to provide the Royal Academy with some other place of exhibition. (Hear, hear.) If the Royal Academy should be deprived of the apartments which they at present possessed in Somerset House, so valuable to them for the exhibition of their pictures, and if, as he believed such would be the case, from the increased number of donations, the National Gallery should in time become altogether a collection of pictures by the ancient masters, the Royal Academy would, in his opinion, be entitled to another place for the exhibition of their pictures. He did not think that the hon.

gentleman, in the observations he had made, had done justice to the claim which the Royal Academy would, under such circumstances, have upon the public. With regard to the present vote, he begged to say that it met with his cordial concurrence, and he was sure that it would be hailed by the public at large with the greatest satisfaction. The acquisition of such pictures for the National Gallery was indeed a public benefit, and he could from his own knowledge state that they had been procured upon the most advantageous terms. He knew that 10,500 guineas had been offered for them some years since, and that even a still larger sum had been afterwards offered for them, which he might not mention, but which no doubt the noble lord opposite recollected. An excellent bargain had been made for the public in the purchase of those two pictures, being, as he believed they were, two of the finest works of art in the world. He did not believe that there were twenty pictures in the world finer than those two, and he was therefore sure that it would be acknowledged on all hands that the securing them for the National Gallery was a public benefit. The Government had not given more than their value for them—all the most experienced picture-dealers and artists acknowledged that the bargain was a most advantageous one for the public, and the fact was, that if the Government had not purchased them, a month would not have elapsed until these pictures had been sent out of the country. Again he repeated that he cordially concurred in the vote, and he was certain it was one that the liberal spirit of the house would at once assent to. (Hear.)

Mr. EWART said that with respect to the claim which the Royal Academy had to the apartments which they at present occupied in Somerset House, he supposed it was based on the consideration that the Academy had for its object the encouragement of art, and the promotion and improvement of the public taste. He had intended to give notice of his intention to bring before the house the state of the Royal Academy, and he could not let this opportunity pass without observing, that if the Royal Academy were to have those rooms in the National Gallery for their use, something like a condition should be laid down with respect to the hanging of the pictures. He did not consider it advantageous to the public or to the arts that the principal places for pictures in the Royal Academy should always be occupied by portraits, while the historical pictures were displaced from that position to which they were entitled. The by-laws of the Royal Academy on that point ought to be revised. He entirely concurred with his hon. friend the member for Bridport in supporting the present vote.

Sir M. W. RIDLEY said that he could not allow the observations which had fallen from the hon. member who had just sat down to pass without offering some contradiction to them. That hon. member was entirely misinformed as to the mode in which the pictures in the Royal Academy were hung. The parties themselves had no choice in the place selected—that was regulated by a committee consisting of the best judges, appointed for the purpose, and which was called “the hanging committee.” (A laugh.) He did not believe that anything could be more impartial than the conduct of that committee in selecting places for the pictures to be hung. There was a certain number of Royal Academicians, who were without exception the first men in their profession in the country. Whenever a vacancy occurred in that number, it was filled up by the selection of some first-rate artist. The rule as to the first place in hanging pictures had not been made with reference to portraits in particular. The rule was, that the best pictures should be hung at the “horizontal line.” Now it happened, perhaps to the misfortune of the country, that greater encouragement was given to portrait painting than to historical painting, and the consequence was that there was a larger proportion of portraits than of any other pictures at the exhibitions. The best pictures were generally placed in the best situations, and if complaints had been sometimes made that such was not the case, and that pictures were not placed in the best light, it would be found on inquiry that it was not owing to any partiality on the part of the committee, but to unavoidable circumstances. He begged to say that he cordially concurred in this vote. In confirmation of what had fallen from the right hon. baronet (the hon. member for Tamworth), he could state, that if those pictures had not been purchased by Government, they

would have gone to the King of Bavaria, who would have given several thousand pounds more for them. He was sure the country would not grudge the price that had been given for them.

Mr. RUTHVEN complained that they had had no notice of this vote. He thought this was an extravagant price, especially as the price of paintings had materially fallen in Europe. This was no time, with the poor in many districts of the country reduced to the greatest distress, for such a lavish expenditure for the purchase of two pictures.

Mr. S. RICE said that as to the complaint of the hon. member that due notice of this vote had not been given, he had only to state that it had been like all the other votes for some time lying on the table of the house. As to the contrast which the hon. member had made between the poverty of certain classes in this country and the present vote, he (Mr. Rice) had to remark, that no classes were more interested in every measure taken to improve the intellect or the taste of the community than the mechanical classes in this country. (Hear, hear.) The same objection that had been taken by the hon. member to this vote might have been made to the purchase of Sir W. Hamilton's antique vases, and yet it was now known that the manufactures of this country received a greater impulse from the imitation of the treasures of antiquity, thus placed within reach of the public, than they had ever received from any other source. (Hear, hear.) With regard to what had fallen from the right hon. baronet as to the Royal Academy, he begged to say that it did not follow that if the Royal Academy should be obliged to give up the rooms appropriated for their use in the National Gallery, they would be left without any place for the exhibition of their pictures. The first design of the building was for a national gallery; and if occasion should arise for the use of the rooms that were to be given to the Royal Academy for the purposes of the National Gallery, he trusted that the Royal Academy would be accommodated with some proper place of exhibition elsewhere.

Mr. ROEBUCK said that this was just one of those cases in which money was really laid out for the public advantage. It was his opinion that no class in the country derived more exquisite pleasure from the exhibition of works of art than the poorer classes did, and he was sure that this vote would give universal satisfaction.

Mr. FWART differed from the hon. member for Dublin (Mr. Ruthven) with respect to this vote. It was one, he was sure, that would meet with the general approval of the people. There was nothing more wanting in this country than a national gallery for the cultivation of design. He could not agree with the hon. baronet opposite as to the impartiality of the "hanging committee" of the Royal Academy. He would again repeat, that they gave the best places to their own pictures. He thought that it would be desirable to have a copy of the by-laws of the Royal Academy laid before the house, and it was his intention to move for such copy, if there should be no objection to its production.

Mr. ROEBUCK trusted that when the National Gallery was opened, it and other such like public institutions would be put under such regulations as not to exclude persons from admission to them because they were in the dress of artisans. He knew that such a regulation existed in several public institutions at present. He trusted that it would be done away with, and that the public would be admitted, as they had a right to be, indiscriminately, to institutions supported by the public money.

Sir M. W. RIDLEY said he could bear testimony that such a regulation as that just alluded to did not prevail in all public institutions. He happened last year to be looking at the pictures in Pall-mall, when two sailors, in their sailor's dress, came in to view them; on looking at a sea view, with a vessel sailing, one of them expressed his admiration of the picture in rather an emphatic manner, and employing a word which perhaps he (Sir M. W. Ridley) should not repeat in that house—"D—n it," he exclaimed to his comrade, "d—n it, Jack, see how well she sails." (A laugh.)

Mr. O'CONNELL suggested that a couple of hours should be set apart in the afternoon of Sundays for admitting the people to institutions of this description. (Hear.)—The vote was then agreed to.

The next vote was for the sum of 42,721*l.* for the repair of public buildings, for furniture, &c.; for various public departments; for certain charges of watching, lighting, &c.; and also for the maintenance and repair of Royal Palaces and works in the Royal Gardens, heretofore charged on the civil list.

Mr. WARBURTON regretted there was no estimate for a new House of Commons in this vote. (Hear.)—Agreed to.

The next vote, 10,000*l.* for works and repairs at Kingstown harbour, was agreed to without opposition, as were also 3742*l.* to complete the works at Donaghadee harbour, and 3922*l.* for the improvement of the Holyhead and Liverpool roads, and Holyhead and Howth harbours.

The next vote was 8000*l.* to defray the charge of the new buildings in the British Museum.

Mr. ROEBUCK wished to know whether any calculation had been made as to the amount that would be required for the completion of those buildings.

Mr. RICE said that the hon. member would find in the estimate a statement of the original estimate of what would be required, of the amount that had been expended, and of what was still wanted to complete the whole. The original estimate was 303,000*l.* Towards that there had been already granted 240,400*l.*; and there only remained 67,033*l.* to be voted to complete the whole; of that sum, it was proposed to vote 8000*l.* this year. The hon. member would see that there were in this estimate some expenses not connected with the buildings, such as the expenses incurred during the last year for cases to contain the Egyptian antiquities, fossil remains, &c., and for removing the Egyptian and other antiquities into the gallery recently completed for them. From their experience of Sir Robert Smirke in the erection of other public buildings, they might safely calculate upon it that the expense of these new buildings would be within the original estimate.

In answer to a question from Sir R. INGLIS,

Mr. RICE said that the sum now asked for, in addition to a balance that was remaining over from the last year, would, according to Sir Robert Smirke, afford abundant means for carrying on the buildings during the current year. He could state, he believed, that the architect and the trustees were perfectly satisfied with the amount now proposed to be voted.

Sir S. WHALLEY regretted, on the part of the public, that the holidays during which the Museum was shut so frequently occurred. Measures should be taken to remedy such an evil.

Mr. WARBURTON would also call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the reading-room of the Museum was closed in the evening. Now, a great many individuals were employed the whole of the morning, and the only opportunity they had for reading was in the evening, when the reading-room of the Museum was closed against them. If the object was, as was stated, to prevent the chance of the books being burnt, why not erect a separate room, detached from the main building, and rendered fire-proof, where those persons who were employed in business during the morning might have an opportunity of reading in the evening? Why, he would ask, should the Museum be closed for a certain period in the long vacation? A worse period for closing it could not be selected, as it happened that it was just the time when foreigners and other persons, who wished to consult rare books, were in the habit of visiting this country. As the Treasury held the purse-strings, it had only to issue its directions to the managers of the Museum, and any alteration that it might suggest would be at once carried into effect.

Mr. S. RICE said that this question had been discussed before on former occasions, and the effect had been the securing to the public a greater facility of access to the Museum, of which the public had taken every advantage. It would be seen by any person who visited the Museum that such was the case. Indeed, by inspecting the returns that had been laid before the house, it would be found that an extraordinary number of persons visited the Museum for their gratification and amusement in the course of the year. He would say that even the number that visited it in a single day was extraordinarily great. As to the hon. member's sug-



gestion for opening the reading-room in the evening, he was of opinion that it was one that ought not without a great deal of consideration to be adopted. He was sure that the trustees were anxious to afford every reasonable extent of access to the public. He agreed with his hon. friend that the long vacation was of all others the most inconvenient time for closing the Museum. The matter was one that no doubt would meet with the attention of the trustees. The trustees were most anxious for the fullest inquiry into the rules and regulations of the institution. He had seen a notice early in the session for a committee of inquiry on the subject. He would say, that such a proposition would meet with no opposition from the trustees, for they had no object, and the officers of the institution should have no object, but to make it as useful as possible to the public at large.

After a few words from Mr. ROEBUCK in favour of having the reading-room opened in the evening, the vote was agreed to.

The next vote was 37,000*l.*, on account of the works and alterations at Windsor Castle.

Mr. JAMES was understood to ask when would this expenditure cease?

Mr. S. RICE replied that this sum completed the estimate, which had been already approved of by the house.

The next vote was for 13,000*l.*, on account of the expense of erecting a national gallery.

Mr. EWART said he would take that opportunity to offer a few observations on that subject. It behoved them, in erecting a national gallery, to fill it with works of ancient art, also with works of modern art, to give every facility to the people to see the specimens of both, and to afford every possible encouragement to the artists of the country. Portraits should be removed from that "bad eminence" which they at present occupied, and from a position which was only due to the higher regions of the art—to historical and landscape paintings. Those and other efforts of the art had been unjustly thrown into the shade by the great monopoly of portraits, principally produced, he would maintain, by the monopoly enjoyed by the Royal Academy, who by exhibiting a certain number of pictures, and by placing portraits executed by themselves in the best light and the most advantageous position, had secured a pre-eminence for them. They should take care to remedy that evil in the National Gallery. The number of portraits that were exhibited, and in the best places too, at our annual exhibitions in this country, had, as might be expected, excited the astonishment and the derision of foreigners. He had seen in a late German publication an amusing comparison of the number of portraits that were to be found at the exhibitions in London, with the number to be seen in the exhibitions in the different towns in Germany. The fact was, that in our exhibitions paintings that required mind—that were the offspring of poetical feeling and elevated fancy, had to give place to the exaggerated portraits of some noble marchioness, or of

"Lord Mountcoffee-house, the Irish peer,

Who killed himself for love (with wine) last year."

The two great objects which they should have in view in the erection of a national gallery should be to promote the interests of the arts, and to improve the public taste. Different apartments should be appropriated to historical paintings, to landscape paintings, to portraits, and to sculptures. The sculptures should not be huddled together without taste or arrangement, as they were at present in the Royal Academy, where you might see a bust placed beside an historical group, and the deformed countenance of some modern unknown put in juxtaposition with Mars or Apollo. Every person at present on going to the Royal Academy exhibition had to pay 1*s.* He thought that payment of 1*s.* for admission should be abolished. One of the best modes of cultivating a taste for the arts would be to open the exhibition of modern paintings gratuitously to the public.

Sir R. INGLIS observed that there was this distinction between the exhibition of the Royal Academy and that of the National Gallery, that in the former case the pictures belonged to private individuals, whilst in the latter they were the property of the public.

Mr. SINCLAIR said, that for his part, he derived great gratification from view-

ing the portraits of beautiful women (a laugh), distinguished warriors, and eminent statesmen. (Hear.)

The vote was then agreed to.

Mr. S. RICE said that he had now to propose an estimate for the repair of Westminster Hall. It was intended that the hall should be completely repaired, and, amongst other things, that the ancient flooring should be restored. Some years ago the floor of the hall had been raised two feet, with the view of obviating the danger arising from floods, but it was found that the alteration had not the desired effect, whilst, on the other hand, it destroyed the proportions of the building. It was calculated that the repairs would be completed in two years. The hon. gentleman concluded by moving that the sum of 17,000*l.* should be granted for the repair and restoration of Westminster Hall.

Sir S. WHALLY expressed his hearty concurrence in the proposition. It had long been a disgrace to this country that the finest room in Europe should be kept in a condition no better than that of an old barn. It might, however, be productive of inconvenience to lower the flooring of the hall.

Mr. WYNN suggested, that if the floor of the hall were lowered, Palace-yard should be reduced to the same level, in order to avoid a descent on entering the hall.

Mr. JERVIS hoped that whilst the alterations were in progress, some attempt would be made to render the courts of law more commodious.

The vote was then agreed to, as were the following :—

6700*l.* to defray the expense of erecting revenue-buildings at Bristol.

44,500*l.* for the salaries of the officers of the two Houses of Parliament, and pensions of retired officers.

25,189*l.* for the expenses of the Houses of Lords and Commons.

41,000*l.* to make good the deficiency of the fee fund in the department of His Majesty's Treasury.

10,598*l.* to make good a similar deficiency in the Home Department.

13,337*l.* for ditto in the Foreign Department.

11,737*l.* for ditto in the Colonial Department.

18,658*l.* for ditto in the department of the Privy Council, and Committee of Privy Council for Trade.

2000*l.* for the salary of the Lord Privy Seal.

7500*l.* for contingencies and messengers in the department of His Majesty's Treasury.

5695*l.* for ditto in the Home Department.

39,000*l.* for ditto in the Foreign Department.

7100*l.* for ditto in the Colonial Department.

2232*l.* for ditto in the department of the Privy Council, and Committee of Privy Council for Trade.

3700*l.* to defray the expense of messengers attending the First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, &c.

It was then proposed that the sum of 2000*l.* should be granted to defray the charge of the salaries and allowances granted to certain professors of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

Mr. ROEBUCK, on the part of the Dissenters, expressed his objection to this grant, on the ground that the Universities were conducted on an exclusive principle.

Mr. S. RICE said that he would be always ready to contend for the admission of Dissenters to all the privileges of the University. He should, however, be extremely sorry if the present vote should be rejected, because the payment of the professors imparted to the Universities the character of national institutions, and formed the strongest ground for granting the claims of the Dissenters.

Mr. ROEBUCK was not disposed to concur with the hon. gentleman in voting this estimate, because the subscription of a sum from the public was a good argu-

ment in favour of throwing the Universities open to all classes. He should like to see the Universities thrown open first, and then he should not object to contribute towards their support. He could not see why 2600*l.* should be paid for a good argument. By the present system of exclusion maintained against the Dissenters, they were made to feel that they were considered as an inferior class, and he was sure that that was not the fact. He would not divide the house on the question of the vote, but he must enter his protest against the principle of it, and he would do so year after year, as often as that house was asked to support the professors of those institutions.

Mr. G. F. YOUNG was glad that Dissenters might and did actually at Cambridge receive the benefit of the services of professors belonging to the established church. He regretted that the case was not the same at Oxford, but hoped that an alteration in that particular would soon be effected.

Mr. EWART thought it perfectly fair to take from the Universities the advantages they reaped from the national funds, and give them to the London University or any University, whose system should be less exclusive than those already subsisting.

The vote was then agreed to.

The next vote was, "that a sum not exceeding 1568*l.* be granted to His Majesty, in order to pay the salaries and contingent expenses of the office for the registration of aliens," which was agreed to.

The next vote was, "that a sum not exceeding 15,563*l.* be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charges of the Penitentiary at Millbank," which was agreed to.

580*l.* was then voted to make good the deficiency in the fees in the office of the registrar of colonial slaves in Great Britain for the half year commencing the 1st of April, and ending the 30th of September, 1834.

4336*l.* was voted for defraying the charge for one year, from April 1834, to the 31st of March, 1835, of the salaries and other expenses of the State Paper-office, the office for the custody of records in the Tower, and the office for the custody of records in the Chapter-house, Westminster.

800*l.* was voted for the year ending 31st March, 1835, to defray the expenses of the commission for inquiring into the practice and proceedings of the superior courts of common law, to the termination of the commission.

16,200*l.* was voted to pay the salaries, &c., of the slave-commissioners, on the part of His Majesty, under treaties with foreign powers.

95,486*l.* was proposed to be granted for the year ending March 31, 1835, to defray the charge of the salaries of His Majesty's Consuls-General, Consuls, and Vice-Consuls, and of the Superintendents of Trade at Canton, and also of their contingent expenses.

Mr. HUNT moved, as an amendment, that the vote be reduced by 12,800*l.*—that is, to 82,686*l.*

Major BEAUCLERK seconded the amendment.

Mr. S. RICE opposed it.

Mr. GROTE could not but observe that the amount now paid to British Consuls in foreign states was exorbitant, and he found it impossible to reconcile the scale upon which the payments and allowances were made with any principle that he could recognize as grounded upon the weight, the variety, or the importance of the duties to be performed. In the United States, with which our commercial relations were extensive, he found that the consuls stationed at New York received only 800*l.* a-year, and other consuls in other parts of the United States were paid only at the rate of 500*l.* a-year, while at Port-au-Prince the consul received 1200*l.* a-year, and the vice-consul 500*l.*; at Lima the payment was 2000*l.* to the consul, and 700*l.* to the vice-consul. Looking at these very objectionable characteristics of the system, he was perfectly ready to support the amendment with a view to reduce the amount of payment to a just proportion with the duties performed.

Mr. ROXBUCK contrasted the rates of payment to consuls in Egypt with those

enjoyed by similar officers in the United States, and again the differences between the salaries of the British Consuls at Hamburg and Amsterdam, observing that the whole estimate was full of the grossest inconsistencies.

Colonel EVANS said that the consular expenses in the Levant were as much as 10,000*l.* a-year, and they were very considerable in Spain, where certainly our commerce was at least not flourishing.

Mr. S. RICE was sure the committee would agree with him as to the impossibility of bringing the consular payment within any strict rule. The case of the consuls stationed in Egypt had been mentioned; on that he should beg to remind hon. members, that the British consul stationed at Alexandria was placed there under very special circumstances, and that the present state of Egypt furnished a sufficient answer to any objection that might be urged to the rate of payment,—a rate which must be governed as well by various other circumstances as by the expenses of living at the several places where consuls might be stationed. He begged further to state, that the reason of the great difference between Hamburg and Amsterdam arose from the fact of our having no diplomatic agent at the former place.

Mr. G. F. YOUNG begged to remind the right hon. baronet, the First Lord of the Admiralty, that in the year 1830, he had stood forward as an advocate for fixing 1000*l.* a-year as the highest rate of payment to consuls; that was surely introducing a general rule,—the exception, however, which he made, was in the case of the South American Consuls. The hon. gentleman opposite had accounted for the large salary paid to our consul at Hamburg, by saying that we had no diplomatic agent resident there. He could not in the same way account for the remuneration given to the British Consul at Constantinople. On many grounds that had been broached in the course of the discussion, he would say that the whole matter ought to be referred to a committee.

Mr. EWART was of opinion that the rate of payment ought to bear a proportion to the amount of British shipping frequenting the port at which any consul might have been stationed.

Sir H. WILLOUGHBY supported the amendment.

Lord PALMERSTON said that since he came into office it had been in his power to effect reductions in the consular department to the extent of 29,000*l.* That was about one-third of the whole amount, and might, he thought, be taken as a fair earnest of the disposition of the Government to make all possible reductions consistent with the efficiency of the public service. He had reduced all the consuls-general, except in those few instances where the public service required that such officers should be continued, and in every single appointment some reduction was made of the salaries of consuls and vice-consuls; indeed, very strong representations were made to him from all the parties whose salaries were thus reduced, setting forth the hardship of the deduction, and he felt it necessary to reply to them by a general circular, in which he declared the necessity of the reduction, and his inability to revise them in any case. It was objected that there seemed no fixed principle or scale in effecting those reductions, and that the salaries were not proportionate to the amount of the tonnage of shipping at the particular places where consuls were appointed. To this he must say, that in the first place the amount of shipping in any given place was no adequate criterion of the duties of the consuls, for the attention to shipping formed only a part of the duties of a consul. He had various others to perform, such as attending to the complaints of British subjects, and seeing that justice was done to them in the several states where they resided, and it was well known that in the South American states this formed a heavy part of the consul's duties. The consuls had likewise many returns to make to the Foreign-office, some of a statistical nature, and others relating to commerce and to the produce of grain, which imposed upon them a considerable degree of labour. Then, again, in many places the consuls had political duties to perform, which would account for the large salaries of some of them as compared with others. As to the larger amount of salaries in different places, where nearly the same amount of duty was to be performed; for instance, in Marseilles, as compared with Bordeaux, it would be explained by the fact, that in some places the reduction had been made when the office of consul became vacant, when a

much larger reduction could be made than from a party who had already held it. Much also would depend on the reduction of salaries, or the amount of fees which some consuls received as compared with others. As to the plan of reducing or rather raising the salaries of consuls-general to 1000*l.* each, he would observe that it would not be a sound course. It would be establishing a general rule where no general rule could apply. Each case must be considered according to its peculiar circumstances. There were only three consuls-general in Europe whose salaries exceeded 1000*l.* a-year. There was the consul-general at Hamburgh, who had 1500*l.* a-year, but it should be considered that we had no diplomatic agent at the Hans Towns, and that the consul-general at Hamburgh was called upon to perform duties as our diplomatic agent for those towns. With respect to the consul-general at Alexandria, he had, as had been already observed by his hon. friend (Mr. S. Rice), most important political functions to exercise, and his salary ought to bear some just proportion to the nature of those functions, but he must add that the salary was less than that of his predecessor, Mr. Salt, and was as low as he (Lord Palmerston) conscientiously believed ought to be given for such duties. An hon. member had objected to the high salaries given to our consuls in the South American states. He had already adverted to the onerous nature of some of their duties, but let him add, that though the nominal amount of those salaries might be high, that amount ought to be considered with reference to the quantity of the necessaries of life which it would purchase. Now, it was well known that where the precious metals abounded, the value of money was greatly diminished in its relation to the necessaries of life, as compared with places where those metals were not so abundant. The salaries of the consuls to the South American states, therefore, though larger in nominal amount, were not in effect greater in relation to what they could purchase there than numerically smaller salaries in other places. The noble lord then went through several other items in the consular list, which had been already touched upon by the hon. member for Cambridge, and contended that in every case reductions had been made to as great an extent as circumstances would admit. It would, he added, be idle to make a rule-of-three question of each case, and to contend that each consul should be paid according to the tonnage of shipping at each port. No general rule, he repeated, could be laid down which could be made applicable to every case.

Mr. PEASE was understood to say that reductions might often be made with effect where the largest number of vessels entered the port to which the consul was attached, for there the greatest amount of fees was generally collected.

Mr. CLAY thought that the speech of the noble lord (Palmerston) was the best ground for referring this matter to a select committee, for though the noble lord had shown that no general rule could be applied to all cases, he had failed to answer or explain some of the anomalies which had been pointed out. He had not explained why in some places there was a consul-general, but no vice-consul, and why both consul-general and vice-consul were kept up in other places where we had a resident diplomatic agent, as in the case of Lisbon and other places. To these no sufficient consideration was or could be given in the committee of the whole house, and therefore the whole ought to be referred to the committee above stairs. He would not say that the noble lord might not be able to give a satisfactory explanation of every item in the list to a select committee, but as such details could not be well entered into in that house, he thought it would be a just ground for the house to refuse the vote until some such preliminary inquiry had been gone into.

Mr. HURT thought that after the turn the debate had taken, he should best consult the object he had in view if he withdrew the suggestion he had made, with the view of making a motion for referring the whole subject of our consular establishment to a select committee, which he would do on the bringing up of the report, for it was perfectly clear that cases of great anomaly and gross extravagance in the expenditure of the public money existed in many of those appointments, and on this ground he did look for the support of the house and of the Government in the motion which he intended to make. He would not then follow the noble lord into the details to which he had gone, but he feared that

neither in that house nor in a select committee would the noble lord be able to convince him of the propriety of giving 2000*l.* a-year to one consul at Lima, and only 600*l.* a-year to another at Marseilles. Neither could he concur in the large salary of 1500*l.* a-year, and as much more in fees, to our consul at Hamburgh, when he found that the Austrian and American consuls at the town had each a salary not exceeding 500*l.*, and he had never heard of any complaint being made by the merchants of either of those countries that every attention had not been paid to their business. The British consular system was a vicious one. It was a part of that Toryism and sinecurism which he had hoped to see abolished in a reformed Parliament.

Lord PALMERSTON did not understand what the hon. member meant by "Toryism," as applied to our consular system; but he could easily comprehend what was meant by "sinecurism," and certainly he must say that no term could be less applicable to our consuls. They were men always at their posts; or, if absent for a short time, were bound to find proper persons to discharge their duties, and to have a diminution of their salaries during their absence. He would add, that no body of men in the public service less deserved censure for the manner in which their duties were discharged. As to the consul-general at Hamburgh, he would beg of the hon. member to suspend his opinion on the subject of the complaints made by his constituents, until he had the opportunity of hearing the matter fully explained, when he had no doubt the hon. member himself would be ready to admit that those complaints were wholly without foundation.

Colonel EVANS wished to know where our consul-general in Austria resided.

Lord PALMERSTON said that he resided chiefly at Milan, but he had various duties to perform which often required his presence at other places.

In answer to a question from Mr. CLAY,

Lord PALMERSTON said that vice-consuls were necessary in many places where it became the duty of a consul or some person for him to visit vessels on their arrival in foreign ports.

The amendment was then withdrawn, and the original motion was agreed to.

The next vote was, that a sum not exceeding 5700*l.* be granted to defray the charge of salaries to superintendents of Factories under the Factory Regulation Act.

Mr. BROTHERTON said he felt it to be his duty to call the attention of the house to the fact that, notwithstanding the recent act of Parliament, children were still worked in factories 12 hours a-day, and had in some cases been required to labour on holydays, and in a very recent instance upon Good Friday. He hoped the Government would not fail to look to these circumstances, in order that the provisions of the late act of Parliament might be fully and fairly carried into effect.

Mr. RICE said that time must be allowed to the commissioners, appointed pursuant to the provisions of the act in question, before it could be expected that they would be enabled to bring the measure into full and perfect operation. With reference to the travelling expenses of the commissioners, which had been referred to by the hon. member for Durham, he (Mr. Rice) could only say that he conceived a fixed scale had been provided by the act itself; and he was also of opinion it was more satisfactory to call for a vote of the house in this respect, than to make those expenses payable out of any particular fund.

The vote was then agreed to, as were also the following:

58,858*l.* to defray the Charge of Allowances or Compensations granted as Superannuations or retired Allowances to persons formerly employed in the Public Service.

12,231*l.* for the Relief of Toulonese and Corsican Emigrants, Dutch Naval Officers, and American Loyalists.

1823*l.* to defray the expenses of the National Vaccine Establishment.

3000*l.* for the support of the Refuge for the Destitute.

3137*l.* to defray the Charge of Confining and Maintaining Criminal Lunatics.

4992*l.* for the usual allowances to the Protestant Dissenting Ministers and French Refugee Clergy and Laity.

On the vote of 37,600*l.* to defray the charge of his Majesty's Foreign and other Secret Service being put,

Colonel EVANS said that he hoped that the further proceedings of the Committee of Supply would be now postponed, in order that the bill for the repeal of the house-tax, which stood for this evening, might be proceeded with.

Mr. S. RICE was understood to object to the postponement desired by the hon. and gallant member, as the hour had not been then exceeded at which it had in former times been usual to proceed with the estimates.

Colonel EVANS repeated his objection, and urged that the public looked with considerable anxiety to the progress of the bill to which he had alluded.

Lord ALTHORP said that he was most anxious to proceed with the bill in question, but he hoped the Government would be permitted to take such a time for proceeding with that measure as to them might seem most advisable. (Hear, hear.)

The vote was then agreed to, and on the vote of 56,000*l.* to defray the expense of printing acts of Parliament, reports, &c., being put,

Sir S. WHALLEY objected to the estimate, as not furnishing a sufficient detail of the expenditure of so large an amount.

Mr. RICE remarked that it was impossible to enter into a detail, as the printing of reports, &c., was in general the act of the house itself.—The vote was agreed to.

The next vote was that of 131,918*l.* to defray the expense of stationery, printing, and binding, for the various departments of the Government. On the vote being put,

Sir S. WHALLEY objected to the vote, as being most extravagant. He was at a loss to know how so large a sum as 8000*l.* should be required for the stationery, &c., of the Admiralty department, and 1100*l.* for Chelsea Hospital. This branch of expenditure, which had much increased of late years, ought to be submitted to the consideration of a committee.

Mr. RICE remarked that the increase in the amount of the estimate had taken place since the Government had taken the stationery department into their own hands, but it should not be forgotten that thereby a considerable reduction had been effected by the change which had taken place—namely, by the abolition of the establishments which had been kept up for this service. He would instance the expense in this branch for Scotland alone, which, though formerly 10,000*l.*, was limited in the present estimate to 4500*l.* With respect to Chelsea, the number of letters from there exceeded that of any other similar department.

Mr. JERVIS begged to call the attention of the Government to some incongruities which he noticed in the estimate now under the consideration of the house. He observed that the estimated expense of stationery for the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland was 100*l.*, while the Court of Common Pleas in England was only estimated at 20*l.* With regard to the Court of King's Bench, the estimated expense was for England 100*l.*, and yet for Ireland 225*l.*; and the stationery for the Irish Court of Exchequer was estimated at 310*l.*, and yet the Court of Exchequer for England had only an estimate of 20*l.*

After a few words from Mr. WALLACE, the vote was agreed to; as were also the following votes:—10,000*l.* to defray the expenses of the Mint in the coinage of gold; 8000*l.* to defray the expenses incurred in the prosecution of offences against the laws relating to coin, and 11,000*l.* to defray the expense of law charges.

On the motion that 73,662*l.* be granted to defray the charge of confining, maintaining, and employing convicts at home and in Bermuda; and in providing clothing for the convicts who may probably be transported to New South Wales and Van Dieman's Land, being proposed,

Mr. PEASE inquired what were the intentions of Government with respect to the system of the hulks?

Mr. S. RICE replied that that system was in progress of reduction.

Mr. G. YOUNG thought that the system ought to be completely done away with.

Lord HOWICK said that it was the intention of Government to put an end to the system, but this could not be effected immediately, because there was a considerable number of convicts on board the hulks whom it would be impossible to send abroad.

The vote was then agreed to.

A vote of 20,000*l.* to defray the expenses for the support of captured negroes and liberated Africans, under the acts for the abolition of the slave-trade, was next proposed and agreed to, after a protest against it from Sir S. WHALLEY, as being an useless expenditure of the public money.

The sum of 130,000*l.* was then granted to defray the charge of maintaining convicts at New South Wales and Van Dieman's Land.

On the vote of 10,000*l.* to defray the expenses incurred under the direction and management of the commissioners of records being proposed,

Mr. J. RIVIS said, he wished to know whether the commissioners were proceeding with all necessary despatch, and at what time a report might be expected from them? He thought that as the commissioners were well paid, and were assisted by a secretary, who received 1000*l.* a-year, the public had a right to expect that they would bring their labours to a close as speedily as possible. He presumed that they were not overburdened with business, for he observed that one of the commissioners of records was also employed as a commissioner to inquire into the municipal corporations.

Mr. S. RICE said that it was impossible for him to tell at what time the commissioners of public records would terminate their investigations, but he wished the house to understand that a great part of the present estimate was for work actually done. The hon. gentlemen was wrong in stating the salary of the secretary to be 1000*l.* a-year, it being, in fact, one half of that sum. He was also in error when he described Sir F. Palgrave (for it was to that individual to whom the hon. gentleman alluded) as being a commissioner of records. Sir F. Palgrave was not a commissioner, but was employed by the commissioners as editor of the *Rolls of Parliament*, at a salary of 1000*l.* He was also appointed to the custody of the records of the Chapter-house, an office perfectly compatible with the discharge of the duties imposed on him by the commissioners of public records, and the salary of 500*l.* attached to that situation went to make up the salary which he received as editor of the *Rolls of Parliament*; so that his appointment afforded a means of reducing the amount of the estimate.

An hon. MEMBER objected to the plurality of the situations enjoyed by Sir F. Palgrave, who, he thought, had cut out enough work for himself in his capacity of commissioner of inquiry into municipal corporations. Perhaps the house was not aware that this gentleman had sent to the clerks of the different corporations a list of questions, one of which related to the religious opinions entertained by the freemen.

Mr. S. HAWES put it to the house whether the question just alluded to was one which ought fairly to be asked by the corporation commissioners?

Mr. G. YOUNG said that the commissioners had put questions to the clerks of companies which it was impossible for them to answer. He was of opinion that if Sir F. Palgrave had had no other duty to discharge but that of corporation commissioner, he would have paid more attention to the framing of these questions.

After a few words from Mr. GROTE, the vote was agreed to.

The sum of 2500*l.* was voted to pay the annual compensation awarded to Sir Abraham Bradley King, late King's stationer in Ireland, for losses sustained by him by reason of the revocation of his patent.

The sum of 5000*l.* was voted to defray the expense of paying the fees due and payable to the officers of the Parliament on all bills for continuing or amending any acts for making or maintaining, keeping in repair, or improving turnpike roads, which shall pass the two houses of Parliament and receive the Royal assent.



On a vote of 20,000*l.* being proposed to enable His Majesty to issue money for the erection of school-houses, in aid of private subscriptions for that purpose, for the education of the poorer classes in England,

Major BEAUCLERK said that he entirely agreed in the principle of the vote, and he heartily gave it his support.

Mr. HAWES also spoke in approbation of the vote, and said that the house and the country ought to be grateful to the Government for the manner in which the money had been distributed. (Hear, hear.) The grant of this sum of 20,000*l.* had had the effect of inducing private individuals to subscribe, and no less an amount than 60,000*l.* had been raised in that way. (Hear, hear.)

Lord MORPETH believed that no public grant of so limited an amount had ever been productive of so much good. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. EWART cordially supported the vote, and suggested the propriety of instituting normal schools, after the plan adopted by the Prussian Government.

Mr. G. YOUNG and Sir S. WHALLEY both expressed their approval of the vote.

Mr. RICE said that it was gratifying to him to learn, not only that the vote itself was approved, but also the principles upon which the money had been administered. The Government had been told, when this vote was first proposed, that if they did not give away the money unconditionally, the object they had in view would fail. They had not, however, so acted, for they required all parties applying to Government for the establishment of schools first to put down some of their own money for that purpose. They also paid over the fund to the two societies to whose care its distribution was intrusted in such a manner as to excite competition and rivalry between them. The result was, as might be seen from the returns on the table, that by the grant of 20,000*l.* of the public money an expenditure of 48,111*l.* had been insured, and permanent means of instruction provided for 30,366 children. (Hear, hear.)

An hon. MEMBER was understood to complain of the exclusion of Scotland from the benefit of the proposed grant.

Mr. S. RICE said that the reason why Scotland was not included in the grant was, because the vote was in the first instance more or less an experimental vote, though he was free to confess that it now assumed somewhat of a different character.

Mr. G. F. YOUNG hoped that Government, in consequence of the favourable disposition evinced by the house with regard to this vote, would be induced to bring forward a proposition for a moderate extension of the grant, in order to its application to Great Britain generally.

Mr. GROTE expressed his cordial approbation of the vote. He was of opinion that Government ought to extend it; but with the limited means in their hands, they had certainly done as much as could well be expected of them during the last year. He hoped they would be animated to still greater exertions in future.

Mr. S. RICE said, as there were several notices on the books with respect to the general question of education, there would be other and more fitting opportunities for discussing the subject; but there was one proposition which had been thrown out, and which deserved the greatest possible attention—he alluded to the establishment of normal schools, which he had no doubt would be of the greatest possible advantage, inasmuch as they would tend materially to improve, not only the schools to be built, but also those which were at present in existence (hear, hear); and he hoped his noble friend would authorise him, before the close of the present session, to make some proposition to the house upon the subject. (Hear.)

Mr. A. JOHNSTONE was understood to threaten an amendment, with the view of immediately extending the grant to the purposes of education in Scotland.

Lord ALTHORP hoped the hon. gentleman would not persevere in his amendment on the present occasion. The case of Scotland was no doubt entitled to the consideration of the house, but the present vote had been calculated for England alone. The reason why it had not been originally extended to Scotland was, its being understood that some provision already existed in that country to a con-

siderable extent, while at the same time it was considered advisable that the experiment, to have full justice, should be tried in England, where no such system had been in operation. As to the extension of it, he could not at present positively pledge himself, but he would certainly take the opportunity of calling the attention of the house to it at some future time.

The vote was then agreed to.

Mr. S. RICE then stated that at that advanced hour he would not trouble the house further than by moving the civil contingency vote of 130,000*l*, which was agreed to without observation.

The house then resumed, and the report was ordered to be received to-morrow.

On the motion of Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the Bribery at Elections Bill went through committee, the report was brought up, and ordered to be taken into further consideration on Wednesday next.

On the motion of Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the second reading of the House-tax Repeal Bill was postponed till Wednesday next.

The other orders of the day were then disposed of, and the house adjourned at a quarter past 12 o'clock.

## GOVERNMENT AND AFFAIRS OF UPPER AND LOWER CANADA.

THIS was a subject brought before the House, in an able speech by Mr. ROEBUCK, on Tuesday evening. The matter was treated at considerable length by the hon. mover; and many facts of importance were stated by him to show the wretched state of things in Lower Canada especially. The motion was for a Committee to inquire into the means of remedying the evils which exist in the *form* of the Government now existing in Upper and Lower Canada; and the argument was directed to show that it was chiefly owing to defects in the *form* of the Government that the evils complained of had arisen.

Mr. STANLEY, as Secretary for the Colonies, met the motion, not by a negative, but by an amendment, which confined the duties of the Committee to consider the grievances complained of in the year 1828, by the inhabitants of Lower Canada, and how far they had been redressed; and to inquire into certain other grievances set forth in the resolutions passed by the House of Assembly of Lower Canada, in the present session. This amendment being carried, the Government had the appointment of the Committee, and their names will be found in another page, under the proper head.

The debate was, on the whole, satisfactory, as it gave publicity to many facts connected with the Government of Canada, not generally known: and as it pledged the House to an inquiry which can scarcely fail to produce great good. The length, however, to which we have given the debate on the Estimates, in our previous pages, and the claim on our remaining space for some account of the debate on Lord Althorp's resolution for the Commutation of Tithes, prevents our giving more than a portion of the opening speech on the Canada question, with a short abstract of what followed it.

Mr. ROEBUCK said that his excuse for pressing forward the motion at the present time was the extreme emergency of the matter—the critical and extraordi-

nary position of the colonies to which the motion related. In order to induce the house to accede to his request for this committee of inquiry, it would be his business, in the observations with which he should accompany it, to prove the following, among other things :—1st. That the provinces were at that moment in a state nearly approaching to open revolt ; that Lower Canada particularly, as far as words could go, was actually in a state of revolution, the House of Assembly, their House of Commons, having formerly seceded from all communication with the Executive, and also having expressly declared their intention to impeach their present Governor, Lord Aylmer.—2dly. He should endeavour also to show that the present disturbed state of these countries was the result of a long series of continuous bad government, and that the actual outbreaking of the people at the present moment sprang immediately from the extremely rash and petulant behaviour of the present Secretary for the Colonies, who, unfortunately for this country, after having successfully fanned Ireland into a flame, had employed the same qualities to the same end in our transatlantic possessions.—3dly. His last object, after having pointed out the evil, would be to suggest the remedy, and to that end he should endeavour to explain why he desired a committee of inquiry. He would observe, before he entered upon the descriptions with which he should be obliged to trouble the house, that his remarks would for the most part apply to both provinces, though his illustrations, for the purpose of avoiding confusion, would be drawn chiefly, if not exclusively, from one—viz., Lower Canada. In order to make any one competent to decide upon the resolution now before the house, it was necessary to give some description, however brief, of the government to which it related.

Every one tolerably acquainted with the history of our colonies knew that the constitution or form of government now enjoyed by the Canadas was conferred on them by 31 Geo. III. c. 31. The province of Quebec was by that act divided into the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and in imitation of the form existing in England, a triple power was created in that province, consisting of—1st, the Governor, who was supposed to be analogous to the King here ; 2d, the Legislative Council, supposed to be analogous to the House of Lords ; and 3d, the House of Assembly, analogous to our House of Commons. It was necessary that he should say a few words upon each of these three estates. The governor, be it remembered, was a person sent from England, was removable by the will of the King, and, while in Canada he was a portion of sovereignty, he was but the immediate servant of the Government here. He, then, it was clear, bore little or no analogy to the King of England. He was an officer chosen by the Executive, and responsible to the people of England. Next came the Legislative Council. These councillors were appointed by the King, and for life. There was no landed aristocracy in Canada ; and certainly the Legislative Council, even if it were to concede that such an aristocracy existed, could not be said to represent it. They were usually old official persons appointed to the office of councillor, as a reward for services, or for certain other purposes to which he should immediately advert. Lastly, the House of Assembly did really represent the people, at least in Lower Canada. There might be some doubts as to the completeness and purity of the representation in the upper province. Such, then, was the legislative body. The Administrative or executive consisted—1st, of the governor ; and 2d, a council, called the Executive Council. Now, one of the grand causes of all the bad government that had so long tormented these provinces was the composition of the Council, and that of the Legislative Council. These bodies hitherto had been two in name, but one in fact—the persons composing the one being the majority in the other ; so that the persons composing the Executive Council could at any time put a stop to all the proceedings of Government, and follow to the utmost the sinister interests which they and their dependents wished to forward.

If the house felt at all desirous of understanding the political condition of these provinces, it was absolutely necessary for them to obtain a very definite conception of the character of the Executive Council, and their dependents and connexions ; as the governors sent from England went to the colonies only for a short period, and also exceedingly ignorant of every thing connected with the

business they were about to undertake, it was necessary that there should be always some persons existing ready and able to instruct their ignorance—those persons were the Executive Council. They were always in the colony, and formed the necessary link between succeeding governors. To persons thus serviceable, rewards were necessarily given, which rewards consisted of various places, money, or money's worth, paid out of the provincial funds. Besides, these people formed a special society, and surrounded and hemmed in the governor, so that no one but of their tribe or party could reach him. They actually governed the country, disposed of all its places of honour and distinction, and not only ruled but insulted the people. Being thus really independent of all controul, their insolent rapacity and corruption knew no bounds; and if at any time the governor, or even the home Government, did aught to offend their high mightinesses, they rebelled and treated with scorn and contumely the commands sent from England. While such was the nature and conduct of this petty and vulgar oligarchy, he besought the house to consider the peculiar position of the people over whom they domineered. The people were in habits of daily, nay hourly intercourse with the Republicans of the United States of America. They were accustomed to behold across the frontier a great people not more instructed, not more desirous of good government than themselves, self-governed—governed by thoroughly democratic institutions; and what was the result? A state of unexampled prosperity—quiet, rapid, and unceasing improvement; laws and institutions that continued in their action regular as a piece of physical machinery. They saw free government, and yet perfect protection—they saw the governing body having interests identical with the people, and possessed of their ever-advancing spirit of improvement—being all enterprise—in fact, performing the true functions of government—not contented with protecting to its uttermost, property, persons, and reputation to all citizens, but assisting in all those great undertakings which are best forwarded by the combined efforts of a whole people. With such a view before them it was not wonderful that the Canadian people had imbibed the free spirit of America, and that they bore with impatience the insolence, the ignorance, the incapacity, and the vices of a nest of wretched officials, who under the fostering domination of England had constituted themselves an aristocracy, with all the vices of such a body, without one of the redeeming qualities which were supposed to leaven the mischiefs, and which were the natural attendants on all aristocracies.

The remainder of Mr. ROEBUCK's speech was occupied with details of the grievances and evils which this system of government has engendered. And on these he considered he had made out a case for that Committee which his motion went to ask the House to appoint.

The motion was seconded by Mr. O'CONNELL and Mr. HUME, both of whom rose together for the purpose, but without a speech from either, at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. Secretary STANLEY then rose to reply; and in the course of a speech of great length, which occupies several columns in the daily papers, he produced official documents in great number, to explain and contradict many of the assertions made by Mr. Roebuck, and to prove that Upper Canada at least was in a state of perfect tranquility and contentment, and that even in Lower Canada the state of things arose rather from the misconduct and turbulence of certain disaffected individuals, than from any general feeling of dissatisfaction with the form of the Government, or the conduct of its authorities. In short, the whole question seemed a parallel to that of Ireland, in the last session; the party advocating the cause of the people, alleging their discontent to be sufficiently accounted for by the tyrannous and oppressive conduct of the Government; and the Secretary, Mr. Stanley, doing in the case of Canada, just as he had done in the case of Ireland, drawing out from his official box, laid on the table of the House of Commons

official documents and state papers, to show, that whatever disturbances had been created were fomented rather by the agitation of demagogues and malcontents, than by the reasonable dissatisfaction of intelligent and respectable men.

The opinions and statements of the mover and opposer in this debate were so contrary to each other, that the appointment of the Committee was indispensable in order to settle who was right and who was wrong in the positions they had taken up. The remedies, too, were as opposite to each other, as the opinions as to the nature and extent of the evil. Mr. Roebuck, Mr. O'Connell, and Mr. Hume, who spoke on the same side of the question, advocated a greater extension of power to the popular branch of the Canadian Legislature, and a curbing the power of the aristocratical branch; while Mr. Stanley, Mr. P. Stewart, Lord Howick, and others, who spoke on the Government side of the question, adverted to the possibility of curing the evil, by a Legislative Union between Upper and Lower Canada, so as to have but one authority presiding over both, and exercising to a greater extent the prerogative of the Crown, and the power of the Parliament in England over the refractory Colonies.

We scarcely need inform our readers to which set of views and opinions we most strongly incline; advocating, as we have done all our lives, the emancipation of all our Colonies from their present dependence on the parent State; and believing that in every country the more completely we can leave every separate state and province to its own self-government, without foreign aid or foreign control, the more shall we be likely to see all countries flourishing and happy.

#### WAR EXPENDITURE.

THE whole expenditure, from 1793 to 1815 inclusive, may be thus given, including the probable cost of collecting:—

In the 9 years, from 1793 to 1802 . . . . .	£ 514,260,000
In the 6 years, from 1803 to 1808 . . . . .	400,000,000
In the 7 years, from 1809 to 1815 . . . . .	679,789,973

£1,594,049,973

Of this immense sum, 1,187,509,864*l.* were obtained by taxation, and 407,540,109*l.* were raised by borrowing, for which stock or funds were created, amounting to 631,088,832*l.*!! increasing the national debt from 233,733,609*l.* to 864,822,441*l.*!!  
—*Hopkins' Great Britain for the last Forty Years.*

#### EXPOSURE OF A COMMON ERROR.

Were it true, as has been sometimes stated, that population has a tendency to increase more rapidly than capital,\* all endeavours to improve the condition of the people would be completely idle and abortive. The existence of such a tendency would fix the labouring class in a state, not only of hopeless, but of perpetually increasing misery, and would cause in each succeeding year a greater number to be cut off by famine, and by the epidemics it engenders. The fact, that the condition of the labouring classes has improved with the progress of wealth and civilization, demonstrates that population has not a tendency to increase faster than capital.—*Colonel Torrens.*

---

\* Mill.

## LORD ALTHORP'S RESOLUTIONS AND PLAN FOR THE COMMUTATION OF TITHES.

THE expectation that this subject would be brought on early, filled the House with members at an early hour; but owing to the length of the previous debate on the Canada question, it could not be entered upon till past ten o'clock; and even then was only brought on by the giving way of previous members who had motions entered on the books, to give precedence to this question on Tithes. The debate was heavy, and the noble mover was even more than usually confused and hesitating in his statements; but the great interest and importance of the subject kept the attention alive to the last. The following is an abridged report of the debate.

LORD ALTHORP said, that whatever opinions might be held as to the abstract right to tithes, there could, he thought, be no difference as to the question, that they did not belong to the owners of the land. Another position of the truth of which he was satisfied from all the inquiries he had made on the subject was, that in the present state of the country, the revenues of the established church in this kingdom were not larger than that establishment required. There might be, and no doubt there were, differences of opinion as to the mode in which the revenues of the established church should be applied, but he thought it would be admitted that the amount of those revenues was not greater than the establishment called for. As to the policy of a church establishment, he would not enter into any argument, for he presumed that the great majority of those whom he then addressed concurred with him in thinking that an established church, as connected with the state, ought to exist. He assumed, therefore, that position as one which would be admitted by the majority of the house. He had already said that the landowners had no right to the tithes. They had purchased or inherited their property subject to the payment of tithe, and whether Protestants of the established church, or Dissenters from it, the same rule applied—that they had purchased or inherited the nine-tenths of the property, the remaining tenth belonging to the church. They could not therefore complain of the remaining tenth going to other hands, for they had inherited, or made their purchases subject to that condition. Indeed he believed that even from Dissenters no complaint had been made on the ground of the tenth. In dealing then with this tenth, and in any regulation as to the mode in which it was to be collected, it would be admitted, that if the Legislature took it in its present shape, they were bound to give a fair equivalent to those from whom they took it. He knew it might be said, that if a fair equivalent were given for the tithe, it would be no relief to the occupiers of land. From this opinion he differed, for there was in the mode of collection a source of irritation which would be got rid of in the plan which he was about to propose. The tithe-payer and the tithe-owner were now frequently brought into unpleasant collision, which might be avoided by a new mode of collection. This would also be a relief to owners and to occupiers of land, for it was well known that the occupiers of land, whose capital was expended in the cultivation of the soil, were often losers when the tithe was drawn in kind. An exchange of the present mode of payment would therefore be a relief to those classes. In many cases a composition for tithe had been entered into, but this was not on equal terms between the parties, for if the tithe were drawn in kind, there was a loss to the occupier, and the amount of composition for such tithe was often greater than the occupier ought in justice to be called upon to pay. The plan which he was about to pro-

pose would give relief not only to the occupier of the soil, but also to the labourer, by giving to the latter more employment, for it was well known that in most instances more labour would be employed on land, if it were not for the certainty that in proportion to the productiveness of that land there would be more tithe to pay. The composition for tithe, then, would be an advantage, not only to the occupiers of land, but also to the labourers, who would thus get increased employment. But when he spoke of composition, he did not mean to say that a full equivalent should be given, that was equal to the present amount of the tithe. He would go upon the scale of what was the customary payment. That he thought would be a fair equivalent, for no one now looked to what was the just legal right—indeed, it was difficult to say what the legal right was. Many circumstances increased or diminished the value of the tithe, such as the distance from a market-town, the difference of soil, and the expense of cultivation, so that it was a matter of great difficulty to ascertain what was the value of the legal right. The best way, as he had stated to the house last year, was to take the ordinary value.

The course he proposed to adopt was, to fix a different proportion for each of the different counties of England and Wales,\* and the manner in which that object was sought to be effected he should endeavour to explain as clearly as he could; but he trusted that the house would extend to him no small share on that occasion of the indulgence which he was in the habit of experiencing at their hands, for the question was one of difficulty and complication, and therefore one which he found it not easy to lay before them as satisfactorily and as plainly as he could have wished. (Hear, hear.) It was intended, under the bill which he proposed to introduce, that an actual valuation of the tithes should take place in all the parishes in England and Wales, but that separate valuers should be appointed for each county, the object of such valuations being to ascertain the amount of rent and the value of the tithes payable from both arable and pasture, distinguishing the lay impropriations from the tithes payable to ecclesiastical persons. The sums of those various payments were then to be laid before the court of quarter sessions, and by that tribunal the proportion subsisting between the rent and the tithes was to be ascertained, and likewise it would be the duty of the same court of quarter sessions to determine what proportion of the burden should be borne by arable, and what borne by pasture land, so as to preserve the relative pressure upon each in a condition as little altered as possible from its present state, and at the same time to maintain a proportion between rent and tithes as nearly similar as might be to the previously existing proportion between them, the whole being calculated on the average of the country at large, and not confined to the views of particular parishes. He could not conceal from himself that the whole of the plan might at first view appear exceedingly complex, but he looked forward with perfect confidence to its eventually allowing great facility of operation. The hon. gentleman opposite, the member for Essex, when the same subject was under discussion last year, inquired how the tithe of hops was to be regulated? He was prepared, so far as the present plan was concerned, to give an answer to that question; and it would be, that hop lands were to be considered (as we understood) in the light of arable lands. Having made that one remark, he should now proceed with the remaining parts of the proposed measure, requesting the house to bear in mind that the intended valuation was not to be considered final: on the contrary, he intended to allow an appeal to a barrister appointed for the purpose of reconsidering any decision which might occasion sufficient dissatisfaction to bring forth an appeal. He had now stated the general principle of his plan of commutation, and he begged to recall to the recollection of the house that one of the objections of the bill of last year had been obviated by the present plan; for whereas it was alleged against the former measure that while its operation would be to confer an advantage on the harsh and severe collector of tithes, who exacted the uttermost farthing; it would deal unfairly with those whose mode of enforcing their rights was more lenient.

He felt that the plan he was then laying before the house was still liable to the objection, that it did not purify the tithe system from its tendency to check the investment of capital in the improvement of land; but though he did not directly

declare that tithes were to remain stationary, while land went on indefinitely improving, yet in effect he hoped to be able to obviate every thing material that might be found in the very plausible objection to which he was then alluding. If he did not in so many words declare that the further employment of capital was to be tithe-free, he at least afforded every facility for preventing its injurious operation upon the investment of capital, by giving to tithe-payers an easy and equitable mode of redemption. He would give to the owner of the land, whether he paid his tithe to the clergy or to the lay impropiator the right of redeeming such at a certain number of years' purchase. (Hear, hear.) He proposed that the payment for that redemption should be 25 years' purchase—a rate which he thought would be considered fair, as the owner of the land would thereby gain 4 per cent. for the money he advanced, besides securing to himself the full prospective advantage of any amount of capital which he might think proper to invest in the improvement of his property. The sums which might so be paid under that plan of redemption on account of clerical tithes would clearly be clerical property, and might of course, without the least objection, be placed at the disposal of a clerical commission; he should, therefore, propose that in every diocese the bishop, with such other commissioners as he might nominate, should receive the amount paid for the redemption of tithes, and invest the same in land or other securities, for the future advantage of the incumbents of those livings whence they were derived. In order further to facilitate redemptions, he proposed that when the payers of tithes did not find it convenient to discharge the whole sum at once, they might be at liberty to render it an incumbrance on their properties in the nature of a mortgage, but without giving the mortgagee the power of foreclosure—that it should be in effect a mortgage, bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent., but redeemable at the option of the borrower. He did not deny that there might be some difficulty as respected the redemption of lay impropiators, but he did not despair of getting over even that; at all events, this plan might be adopted, and he intended to propose it,—namely, that in such cases the payer of the tithe should lodge his redemption money in the Court of Exchequer, to be drawn thence by the person who should prove himself entitled thereto. Doubtless that plan involved some legal expenses, but he did not see how otherwise difficulties of that nature could be obviated. (Hear, hear.) He begged to assure the house that he felt very sensibly the patience and indulgence with which they had listened to him, for he feared that he had but very imperfectly laid before them the features of his plan. He was aware that there must be considerable complication and difficulty in ascertaining the value of the tithe, but that once done, he felt assured that there would be nothing to interfere with the simple and effective working of the measure. It might be said that the plan he had now propounded would not effect much change; to that he begged to reply, that he should feel much disappointed if the effect of it were not to cause a very extensive redemption of tithes; and should that anticipation be realized, as he had no doubt it would, then should he be enabled to contrast the altered condition of that description of property with its present state, and refer to the change as one well deserving to be called important and advantageous. (Hear.) He should move a resolution to the effect—first, that it was the opinion of the committee that it would be expedient that tithes should be commuted for a payment bearing a certain proportion to the rents; and secondly, that the payers of such tithes should be at liberty to redeem them at the rate of 25 years' purchase. The house would observe, that however anxiously he might desire to relieve the class of religionists called Quakers, from the burden of paying that against which they felt conscientious scruples, yet he had not been able to accomplish it in the present measure. He should have been glad to have removed the difficulty, but he could not see how he could have avoided making the payment compulsory, and the redemption voluntary. The house would also observe that he had done nothing with respect to glebe lands. It might be, he thought, highly desirable to give Ecclesiastical persons the power of leasing equitably for a longer period than their own incumbency; but he thought it could not with convenience be introduced into a measure such as that, however properly it might be made part of another bill. After again dwelling upon the imperfect manner in which he had laid his views before the house, he con-



cluded by moving "That it was expedient that the payment of tithes in kind should cease and determine, and that in the several parishes throughout England and Wales there should be substituted in lieu thereof a payment to the parties who might be entitled to such tithe, such payment bearing a fixed proportion to the annual value of all land whence tithe might be payable, that value to be ascertained throughout the several counties at large, striking an average on the parishes in each county; also that all owners of property liable to tithe be at liberty to redeem the same at the rate of 25 years' purchase."

Mr. HARVEY thought that an excellent principle had been most unnecessarily complicated in the proposed measure of the noble lord. By attending to the various communications he received, he had involved himself in difficulties which might have been very easily avoided. If the noble lord had only set about the measure in his own straightforward business-like way, he would have presented something to the house infinitely more satisfactory and simple. Any auctioneer could tell them the value of any given quantity of tithe, and the rate at which it ought to be redeemed. He feared that the measure would be shipwrecked by its own honesty! The landlord would gain very little by it, for 25 years' purchase would be redeeming at a very dear rate, and in fact no interest would be much the better for it, and the country generally would be disappointed at finding there was nothing to be done with the surplus. It had been asserted that the property of the Established Church was not too much for its occasions; that was a matter of opinion; it might be turned into a matter of fact, for there was at the present moment a commission in existence, with full powers to obtain the information requisite for that purpose. They had issued lists of most searching and effective queries from sixteen to twenty-five in number, and if these were taken advantage of to the extent which they might be, that which was at present a matter of speculation might be rendered matter of fact. The noble lord was already in possession of a mass of information which might negative the opinion that the property of the Established Church was only sufficient for its maintenance. Why shut out from the present measure any consideration of the question how far the possible surplus of church property might be rendered available to public purposes?

Sir R. PEEL said that he could not understand what power the noble lord had to release him (Sir R. Peel) from the obligation which he thought he should incur if he assented to the resolution which had just been proposed. He had only two courses open to him—either to affirm the resolution or vote against it. If he affirmed the resolution, he should consider himself as much bound by it as by any other resolution to which he might give his assent (hear, hear), and by affirming it he expressed his approbation of the several principles contained in it—namely, that a commutation of tithes ought to take place, calculated according to the proportionate value which rent and tithe bore to each other, and also that the redemption of tithe should be permitted at 25 years' purchase. If this resolution was not intended to bind the house, why insert in it any details at all? He begged leave to move, as an amendment, that in lieu of the noble lord's proposition, a simple resolution be passed, declaring it expedient that leave be given to bring in a bill for the purpose of effecting a commutation of tithes in England and Wales. To such a general resolution as that he was ready to give his assent. (Hear, hear.)

Lord ALTHORP admitted that the resolution he had proposed was extremely vague, and said that, had not the forms of the house prevented him from introducing the bill except by such means, he should not have troubled the committee by submitting any resolution whatever to its consideration. However, he thought he recollected having often heard the right hon. baronet (Sir R. Peel) state, when sitting on the ministerial side of the house, that no member, by assenting to a resolution proposed merely as a preliminary to the introduction of a bill, was thereby pledged to support the provisions of the measure. In submitting the present resolution to the committee, his only object was to obtain the power of introducing a bill, but as the right hon. gentleman had objected to it as not being sufficiently general, he had no objection to amend it. He would therefore propose it in an altered state, as follows:—"that it is expedient to effect the commutation of tithes, and to abolish the payment of tithes in kind, throughout England and Wales, and in lieu thereof to substitute another payment to be made to the

"parties entitled to tithes ; and that the power of redemption should be granted to the payers of tithes at a certain number of years' purchase."

Sir R. INGLIS preferred the amended resolution to the resolution as it stood originally, which he considered very objectionable.

Mr. HUME objected to the noble lord's plan, which could not be at all compared with the system adopted in Scotland, for by that system one invariable and fixed rate was established. He thought that the machinery required to work the plan would be very complicated, and recommended the noble lord to follow the mode of ascertaining the value of land practised in Belgium and in France, where every separate field was surveyed, and its value recorded in the *Cadastre*. The noble lord had said that he believed no one in that house would assert that the clergy received too much money. Now he begged to inform the noble lord that there were some individuals in that house who thought that the clergy were too well paid. He was of opinion that the amendment suggested by the right hon. member for Tamworth was preferable to the noble lord's resolution, upon which it was impossible for the house to pronounce any opinion until the information collected by the ecclesiastical commission, and by the noble lord himself, was laid before it. He believed that making the amount of tithe vary with the value of land would operate as a bar to all improvement.

Several speeches were made besides those reported ; and among the speakers were Mr. Alexander Baring, Mr. Greene, Mr. Estcourt, Dr. Lushington, Mr. Parrott, Colonel Wood, Mr. Blamire, Mr. Fryer, Sir Edward Knatchbull, Mr. Finch, Sir T. Fremantle, Sir Henry Wil- loughby, Mr. Rolfe, Mr. F. Lewis, Lord Eastnor, Mr. Jervis, Mr. Aglionby, and Mr. Curteis ; but they were of so conversational and desultory a nature as not to affect the issue of the debate, which terminated in the adoption of Lord Althorp's resolutions as the ground work of his future Bill.

For ourselves, we deny the justice of thus fixing, with even more than its former permanency, the large provision made from the funds of the *State*—which belong to all—for the maintenance of a *Church*, from which nearly half of that all are conscientious Dissenters ; and we still further doubt the practicability of bringing any thing so complicated into easy and satisfactory working in its details ; so that we shall not be at all surprised to find in this plan another of those many abortions, which the present Government have proposed, only to be either withdrawn altogether, or so modified by subsequent changes as scarcely to be cognizable by its original parents : witness the celebrated budgets of Lord Althorp, the Slave Emancipation Act, the Irish Church Reform Bill, the Dissenters' Marriage Bill, and many others that might be named. We think that by this plan of commuting the Tithes, both the landlord and the Church will have good reason to be satisfied ; but we doubt exceedingly whether the *people* will not think that a recognition of the right to the property in Tithes, as belonging to the *State* rather than to the Church—and as such, convertible to national purposes by the act of the Legislature—ought not to have formed a part of any plan for their conversion or commutation, by annual payments, or redemption in full.—Time will show.

---

# INSTANCE OF THE FATAL EFFECTS OF IMPRESSMENT.

SIR,

*Percy Cottage, Blackrock, April, 1834.*

IN the third number of the New Series of the Parliamentary Review is a "Narrative, Illustrative of Impressment." I take the liberty of enclosing a small tract, embracing a more fatal instance of its effects, and of the deep injustice which may be inflicted under the sanction of law. A second anecdote in the same tract more abundantly illustrates the latter truth.

Though these circumstances are not recent, I can never read them without fresh feelings of pain and indignation being excited by their perusal; and as I do not think we are secure from the liability to commit similar injustices, I am desirous those instances of it may be brought again and again before the public, and that those mementos of the past may be held up as warnings for the time to come. For this purpose I now transmit them to the Editor of the Parliamentary Review.

R. T. II.

*Extract from the Speech of Sir William Meredith, in the House of Commons, May 13, 1777.*

"When a member of Parliament brings in a new hanging law, he begins with mentioning some injury that may be done to private property, for which a man is not yet liable to be hanged; and then proposes the gallows as the specific and infallible means of cure and prevention. But the bill, in progress of time, makes crimes capital, that scarce deserve whipping. For instance, the shoplifting act was to prevent bankers and silversmiths' and other shops, where there are commonly goods of great value, from being robbed; but it goes so far as to make it death to lift any thing off a counter with intent to steal.

"Under this act, one Mary Joxes was executed, whose case I shall just mention; it was at the time when press-warrants were issued, on the alarm about Falkland Islands. *The woman's husband was pressed, their goods seized for some debt of his, and she, with two small children, turned into the streets a-begging.* 'Tis a circumstance not to be forgotten, that she was very young (under nineteen), and most remarkably handsome. She went to a linen-draper's shop, took some coarse linen off the counter, and slipped it under her cloak; the shopman saw her, and she laid it down: for this she was hanged. Her defence was (I have the trial in my pocket) *'that she had lived in credit and wanted for nothing, till a press-gang came and stole her husband from her; but since then, she had no bed to lie on: nothing to give her children to eat; and they were almost naked; and perhaps she might have done something wrong, for she hardly knew not what she did.'* *The parish officers testified the truth of this story;* but it seems, there had been a good deal of shoplifting about Ludgate—an example was thought necessary; and this woman was hanged for the comfort and satisfaction of some shopkeepers in Ludgate-street. When brought to receive sentence, she behaved in such a frantic manner, as proved her mind to be in a distracted and desponding state; *and the child was sucking at her breast when she set out for Tyburn [gallows].*

"Let us reflect a little on this woman's fate. The poet says, 'An honest man's the noblest work of God.' He might have said, with equal truth, that a beautiful woman's the noblest work of God.

"But for what cause was God's creation robbed of this its noblest work? It was for no injury, but for a mere attempt to clothe two naked children by unlawful means. Compare this with what the State did, and what the law did. *The State bereaved the woman of her husband, and the children of a father, who was all their support; the law deprived the woman of her life, and the children of their remaining parent, exposing them to every danger, insult, and merciless treatment, that destitute and helpless orphans suffer. Take all the circumstances together, I do not believe that a fouler murder was ever committed against the law, than the murder of this woman by LAW.* Some who hear me are perhaps blaming the judges, the jury, the hangman; but neither judge, jury, nor hangman, is to blame; they are ministerial agents; the true hangman is the member of Parliament; he who frames the bloody law is answerable for the blood that is shed under it."

## NECESSITY OF CAUTION IN LEGISLATING AGAINST THE PRACTICE OF DUELLING.

SIR,

*Hexham, April, 1834.*

I am glad to find that you have given notice of your intention to bring forward some measure in Parliament for the prevention of Duelling. In the success of such a measure every one must feel an intense interest, who has any regard either for the evils it inflicts upon society, or the responsibility to which it exposes its victims hereafter. In proportion to the importance of the subject, ought to be the caution and consideration with which it is introduced; as any indiscretion or inadvertence, on the part of the authors of a remedial measure, is sure to be seized upon, as a pretext for evading all legislation on this delicate, but monstrous subject. I am led to make these observations by the tenour of a letter, signed Belisarius, and published in your PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW. He advises that "the original aggressor in a duel, should be deemed a premeditated murderer." So he is now deemed by the letter of the law; and he being so deemed, no jury will find a culprit, arraigned for duelling, guilty, lest the law should be carried into effect, and the criminal suffer accordingly. Does not this indicate the necessity of some legislative alteration, that may bring the provisions of the law more into harmony with the public feeling? The system of terminating affronts in deadly encounters is, I believe, almost universally reprobated; but that very same aversion to taking away life, which creates the horror of duelling, creates an unconquerable repugnance to repressing the practice by the infliction of capital punishment. Some milder remedy, therefore, is to be searched for in penalties, or other punishments, which the administrators of the law will not hesitate to award. Suppose a fine of 500*l.*, or an imprisonment of three months, were imposed upon every one of the parties, seconds as well as principals, in all cases where a hostile meeting takes place. But where death ensues, the imprisonment should be extended to a full year, without the alternative of a penalty. But it is not any part of my present purpose to adjust the detail, it is sufficient that I have presumed to suggest the principle upon which any innovation in the laws, regarding duelling, should proceed.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

ANTI-DRACO.

## JUST CLAIMS OF OFFICERS AND SEAMEN TO A PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF FREIGHT-MONEY.

SIR,

*London, April, 1834.*

Every British sailor, and indeed every humane man, who has witnessed the horrors of Impressment, must feel they owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Buckingham for endeavouring to do away with that diabolical system. While something is doing to encourage seamen to serve in their country's cause, would it not be desirable to inquire, how is it that the freight-money, for the conveyance of treasure, &c. in His Majesty's ships, is not shared as prize-money, every officer and every man on board having a fair proportion? Must it continue to be, to the grief of every officer and man, that the captain, and he only in the ship, is to pocket the thousands of pounds freightage? Who can read the Naval List and see the 1, 2, and 3 per cent. allowed for the conveyance of treasure in His Majesty's ships, and not wonder that the captain should be the only person in the ship to be benefited by its receipt? It is said that he signs the bills of lading, and in case of loss or damage, that he is liable to repayment of the amount. But he has exactly the same risk in detaining a vessel at sea, under a hope of making her a prize, for if illegally detained he is liable to demurrage, but if she proves to be a prize, then every man in the ship has his share of her value. In the case of treasure-freight, every captain can prevent such risk falling entirely on himself, as he has only to say to his officers and men, "Will you join me in the risk in the same proportion as you would share prize-money?" and the answer would be always be in the affirmative. This, indeed, has been done in some instances, and every man in the ship has signed a declaration to that effect. The same may be done with risk of money carried on freight in all cases; and the shippers would be better secured by the responsibility of a whole crew than by a single individual. If all freight-money were shared as prize-money, the captain would still get a very large amount, and the seamen would have in their smaller shares an additional inducement to serve in the navy.

A SEAMAN.

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

## MAJORITY OF 37.

Tellers included, who, on the 14th of April, voted against the second reading of the St. Pancras Paving Bill.

Abercrombie, Hon. J.	Darlington, Earl	Hughes, H.	Peel, Sir R.
Bannerman, A.	Divett, E.	Howard, P.	Perceval, Colonel
Berkeley, Hon. G.	Eastnor, Viscount	Lowther, Colonel	Rotch, W.
Berkeley, Hon. C.	Finch, G.	Lyall, G.	Scarlett, Sir J.
Brudenell, Lord	Gladstone, W.	Lefevre, C. S.	Strickland, Sir G.
Burrell, Sir C.	Gladstone, T.	Miles, W.	Stormont, Lord
Cavendish, Lord	Halcomb, J.	Morpeth, Lord	Spankie, Sergeant
Christmas, W.	Hay, Colonel Leith	M'Leod, R.	Stuart, Lord D.
Crawford, W.	Hayes, B.	Nicholl, J.	

TELLERS.—Tooke, W.—Wilks, J.

## MINORITY OF 31.

Tellers included, who, on the 14th of April, voted in favour of the second reading of the St. Pancras Paving Bill.

Baines, E.	Grote, G.	O'Connell, D.	O'Reilly, W.
Beaumont, J. W.	Hardy, J.	O'Connell, M.	Roche, W.
Beaucherk, Major	Harvey, D. W.	O'Connell, M.	Roebuck, Jno. A.
Brotherton, J.	Horne, Sir W.	O'Connell, J.	Ruthven, E. S.
Dobbin, L.	Jervis, J.	O'Connor, Don	Ruthven, E.
Evans, G.	Kennedy, J.	O'Connor, F.	Vigors, N. A.
Evans, Colonel	Lambton, H.	Oswald, B.	Wason, R.
Ewart, W.			

TELLERS.—Whalley, Sir S.—Wood, Alderman.

## COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE.

LOWER CANADA.—Select Committee appointed on the 16th of April, "To inquire and report to the House how far the grievances complained of in the year 1828, on the part of certain Inhabitants of Lower Canada, have been redressed, and the recommendations of the Committee of this House which sat thereupon, have been complied with on the part of His Majesty's Government; and to inquire into the matter of certain other grievances not then brought under the consideration of this House, but now set forth in Resolutions of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada in the present Session, and to report their opinion thereupon to the House."

Mr. Sec. Stanley,	Lord Sandon,	Mr. Robinson,	Mr. Waite,
Mr. Roebuck,	Mr. Labouchere,	Mr. O'Connell,	Sir G. Grey,
Mr. F. Lewis,	Sir J. Graham,	Mr. R. Grant,	Mr. Warburton,
Mr. W. Wynne,	Mr. Goulburn,	Sir M. Ridley,	Mr. P. Stewart,
Mr. E. Dennison,	Lord Howick,	Mr. B. Carter,	Mr. Oliphant,
Mr. Loch,	Mr. A. Baring,	Sir H. Hardinge,	Mr. E. Stewart,
Mr. Fazakerley,	Mr. Ellice,	Mr. H. L. Bulwer,	Mr. Romilly,

Power to send for persons papers and records; Five to be the quorum.

## NEW MEMBERS SWORN IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

April 14.—Lord James Stuart, for the Ayr district of Burghs, in lieu of Mr. Kennedy who had resigned.

April 15.—Samuel Crompton, Esq., for the Borough of Thirsk, in lieu of Sir Robert Frankland, Bart, who had resigned.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Several communications are still deferred for want of room, but will appear as soon as space can be commanded; among others, the following are already in type.

"Important Analysis of the Connexion of Crime with Intemperance."—R. K. Greville.

"Origin of British Temperance Societies."

"Interest of Tradesmen, as Overseers, in Increasing the Poor Rates."

"Aristocracy of Wealth, and Despotism of Superiors over Subordinates."—H.

"Effect of Habitual Drunkenness on Families in the Higher and Middle Classes."

C. Whiting, Beaufort House, Strand.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

---

SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1834.

---

KETCH OF LORD DENMAN, BARON DOVEDALE,  
CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE KING'S BENCH.

THE subject of this sketch was born in London, about five-and-fifty years ago. He is the son of the late Dr. Denman, who commenced life as a general medical practitioner, and who afterwards attained the highest eminence as an accoucheur. The work of Dr. Denman, on the Practice of Midwifery, is still considered a standard one among the profession. The author was as highly esteemed in his day as Gooch, Clark, and Merriman, in our own; and if his practice were not as lucrative as that of the second-named gentleman, it was to the full as extensive and respectable. His son, the present Chief Justice, was early destined for the bar. While yet young, he was sent to Eton, where he distinguished himself by some Latin verses, which have since seen the light. In due course of time Mr. Denman was entered of Oxford, where he was chiefly remarkable for his passionate devotion to Belles Lettres learning. At the regular period Mr. Denman became a member of Lincoln's Inn. While a Templar, he was a member of several debating societies, and was further observed to be assiduous in his attendance at the House of Commons, to witness those great contests which were then carried on between Fox and Pitt. About the year 1804, or the beginning of 1805, Mr. Denman was called to the bar. Shortly after he joined the Midland Circuit, which he continued to travel for some years, with small business at first, but which afterwards increased considerably as his forensic talents became disclosed. Meantime Mr. Denman made no scruple of avowing his political opinions; and, indeed, his friendship with Dr. Parr, and the present Lord Chancellor, sufficiently intimated the tendency of his political sentiments. Nor was he long left without an opportunity of putting forth these opinions in the greatest public case of modern times.

In the year 1820, Queen Caroline appeared in England, and shortly after the Ministry of that day proceeded in their Bill of Pains and Penalties against her. The present Lord Chancellor was selected by her Majesty as her Attorney-General, and Mr. Denman was appointed as Solicitor-General. The zeal, if not the discretion of the advocate, was greatly apparent in Mr. Denman's appeal in behalf of his royal

client to the House of Lords. In impassioned accents he called on their lordships to interpose—he threw himself altogether into the case—identified his feelings with those of his royal client, but concluded with a strange application of the injunction of the Saviour, “Woman go thou, and sin no more.” It was attempted then, and has often sought to be inferred since, that this was an admission of guilt on the part of the advocate, but if those who thus arraign the discretion of the counsel will take the trouble to read the whole of the speech of the Queen’s Solicitor-General, they will find that the context by no means bears this interpretation; on the contrary, it will be seen that Mr. Denman most carefully guarded himself against any such inference. The truth is, this scriptural expression was used in reference to another, “Let him who is without sin cast the first stone,” and the practical application of it in the case of which we are speaking, was limited to certain imprudencies, of which the advocate did not defend that his royal client had been guilty.

The appearance of Mr. Denman, in a case of so much importance brought him greatly under the public notice, and on the first vacancy he was elected member for the town of Nottingham. While in Parliament he executed his stewardship with zeal and fidelity. His attendance in St. Stephen’s was most exemplary, though he did not address the House so frequently as might be supposed. As a voter, however, he clearly indicated his sense of the deep responsibility of the trust; for his name was found enrolled in all the important divisions involving constitutional principles. When he did speak, the efforts of Mr. Denman were more remarkable for elegance than strength, and for impassioned and fervid declamation than for depth or profundity. He invariably adopted the cause of the oppressed as his own; and was sure to be found on the weaker and more generous side. Though not taking the lead, which his friend Mr. Brougham’s more general information qualified him to take—he was, nevertheless, found to be an important ally in political questions, and not less in those efforts made by Sir James Mackintosh to improve the administration and mitigate the excessive rigour of the criminal law. It was, therefore, with regret, that his friends—and the popular interest generally—saw him obliged to secede from Parliament—but the claims of a young and numerous family, and the desire to promote their interests by attending exclusively to the duties of his profession, obliged him altogether to surrender to his constituents the important trust with which they had invested him. It was accordingly replaced in the hands of the burgesses of Nottingham, and replaced, unsullied and unstained.

About this period the citizens of London elected Mr. Denman as their Common Serjeant. For several years he executed the duties attached to this office with eminent zeal and ability. We find him pursuing his profession with honour to himself, and advantage to his clients, till the year 1829. As Common Serjeant he had given satisfaction to men of all parties, and as a politician he had enunciated his opinions with so little of personal and party heat, and so much of the fervour of conviction, as to win the applause of his political antagonists—for personal enemies he had none. Struck with his frankness—and that directness and singleness of purpose which have always been main features in the character of Mr. Denman, the Duke of Wellington recommended him to his sovereign in 1829-30 for the honour

of a silk gown. This grace conferred a lustre not less on the dispenser than on the recipient. Nor is Lord Lyndhurst without merit in the transaction, for that eminent functionary forwarded in every possible way the object of the Premier.

Mr. Denman did not again come very prominently before the public till the dissolution of the Duke of Wellington's government. When the present Chancellor was elevated to the seals he was appointed his Majesty's Attorney-General, and Sir William Horne his Solicitor-General. During the period in which he filled this high office, the records of the King's Bench or Common Pleas will be found free from any wanton act of legal oppression. It is true the Hon. Member for Oldham was prosecuted for an article he published about the fires, but the jury in this case acquitted the defendant—a plain proof that it was not packed, as it doubtless might have been during the reign of an Attorney-General less solicitous for the liberty of the subject. In Parliament the Attorney-General defended the general measures of the Crown with zeal—and more particularly the Reform Bill—a measure of which he had always professed himself a warm advocate. As a public speaker he showed himself much superior in power and popularity to his legal colleague—but it were unjust not to say that on the question of the Russian-Dutch Loan both these gentlemen sadly broke down. In fact the question was a difficult one to support. There were views of the question which no ingenuity could gloss over, and difficulties which no talent could overcome; and we will do Sir Thomas Denman the credit to say, that he is not the man to lend himself heart and hand to support any cause, of the justice and purity of which he is not conscientiously convinced.

At length the death of that eminent lawyer, Lord Tenterden, caused a vacancy in the Chief Justiceship of the King's Bench. No doubt if the general opinion of the profession were taken, Sir James Scarlett would have been declared the fittest person for that high office, looking not alone to his merits and ability as a lawyer, but also to his very general and varied attainments as a man—but Sir James had abandoned his party and political connexions—he had not only abandoned these, but his early and openly professed opinions;\* and under these circumstances it would have been wrong in a general point of view for the Whig party to have promoted him, and highly unjust in reference to their political friends and adherents. The reproach of promoting enemies and forgetting friends, is one that has been so often and so justly urged against the Whigs, that we are glad Sir Thomas Denman did not in his person furnish another instance of this political ingratitude. There was, it is true, a large section of the Tory portion of the Bar which vilipended the Government for this promotion. These gentlemen pleased themselves in drawing a disadvantageous comparison between Sir Thomas Denman and Lord Tenterden. We are not among the number of those who will compliment Lord Denman at the expense of truth; and we are therefore very free to admit that as a mere lawyer he is greatly inferior to what Lord Tenterden was, but at

\* Sir James had been early admitted a Member of Brookes's, and in 1809 or 1810 he was admitted a Member of the Fox Club. He regularly attended their dinners at Greenwich till a late period.



the same time we very much doubt if Westminster Hall now furnishes a single individual equal to Lord Tenterden in professional attainments. Let us, however, reverse the case—let us suppose that Lord Grey were a Tory instead of a Whig, and Lord Denman of the same political complexion—then these hypercritics could have found no unfitness in the appointment—on the contrary, they would have applauded it to the very echo, thus demonstrating that it is faction, not principle, in which their abuse originates.

On this subject we may, however, remark that something more than a mere lawyer is required for the office of Chief Justice of the King's Bench. Lord Tenterden had this great qualification in an eminent degree, but then he was deformed by a total want of dignity—by a rude, unpolished, and often brutal demeanour to the Bar. A competent knowledge of the law it is not very difficult to find, but the qualities which should adorn the first magistrate of the country are not to be met with every day. Dignity, patience, blandness, urbanity, and courteous demeanour, one expects to meet with in polished society, but they are not of such frequent occurrence on the Judicial Bench. Though in other respects admirably qualified for the high place of Chief Justice, Lord Tenterden was glaringly deficient in these minor virtues. It was often painful to practise under him; and witnesses, suitors, and the Bar itself have too often been made to feel the infirmities of a temper never very good, but soured of late by age and ill-health. Since the appointment of Lord Denman no complaints of this nature have been made. The new Chief Justice has borne his faculties with blended dignity and meekness, and the Bar as well as the public have been treated with unvarying courtesy and good humour. It is a great advantage—a much greater one than many men would at first sight be inclined to believe—to have the Court of King's Bench under the superintendence and control of a well-bred gentleman; and that Lord Denman is eminently such, no man who has had occasion to visit his Court can venture to gainsay. And when it is borne in mind that the opportunities for the exhibition of profound legal learning are after all rare—and that the great majority of causes are such as occur every day in the common routine of life, the imperious necessity for a profound lawyer does not seem so great as to blind one altogether to the presence of minor, yet most important requisites. Let it be remembered, too, that in intricate cases there is almost always the expedient of the *cura advisare vult*; so that if a Judge be not full of his subject on the first blush, he has generally the opportunity afforded him to replenish his memory, and reburnish the legal armour which he had suffered to rust. The Court of King's Bench, too, is composed of five Judges, and if one of these should, peradventure, err, there are the others to lead him back to the right path. And truly is it necessary that the fantastic profundity and lachrymose simplicity of a Littledale—the black-letter playfulness of a Patteson—and the foggy gloom and uncertain humour of a Tauntón, should be kept in check by the well-bred and decent dignity and mildness of a Denman. Of Mr. Justice James Parke we say nothing in the category of defects; for he is not only perfect as a lawyer, but also possesses the advantage of being a thorough man of the world—but for the other members of the Court it should seem that the disposition and manner of a Denman could not be better employed, than in mixing

itself up with their merits and defects in order to render the judicial tribunal perfect.

As a Judge, Lord Denman exhibits the same high-minded and conscientious spirit which he always displayed at the Bar. In him there was no unworthy trickery—no inordinate love of gain—no mean compliances towards solicitors—no depreciation of rivals. The following is only one of the many instances in which the noble lord, when plain Mr. Denman, exhibited that absence of sordid motive—and that devotion to public principle which are, alas! too rare in all ranks of life.

In the year 1824, a long and ruinous struggle had been maintained by the burgesses of Monmouth, against the Common Council, supported by the Duke of Beaufort. The burgesses at length succeeded in establishing the right of electing their own magistrates from the body at large instead of the Common Council. This right was awarded them by the verdict of two juries—one at Gloucester, the other at Monmouth. At the first Court of Record held by the mayor thus elected, Mr. Thomas Thackwell and seven other gentlemen were elected burgesses of the town, and regularly sworn and enrolled as such. Hereupon the opposite party immediately filed an information against each of the seven gentlemen so admitted. They were called upon to show by what authority they claimed to be burgesses of Monmouth. Harassed and worn out by previous expenses, Mr. Thackwell and his friends prayed the Court of King's Bench to let the validity of the election be decided by the trial of one issue. This after some difficulty was granted, and Mr. Benjamin Yates, a respectable draper, was selected. The venue was removed to Gloucester, and was tried there at the Lent assizes, 1824.

On that occasion Mr. Denman (who had previously subscribed 10*l*. in aid of the cause of these seven burgesses) left the Midland Circuit, travelling from Warwick to Gloucester (the last town in the Oxford Circuit), to defend what he conceived a great public principle attacked in the person of these burgesses. To an advocate, in such full business as Mr. Denman then had, this must have been a serious inconvenience, as well as a great pecuniary loss, but his zeal in the good cause was not to be abated either by distance or difficulty. In his address to the jury, he observed, "that the question to be decided on that day was more the cause of the people of England than any he had ever seen." Nevertheless a verdict was given against Mr. Yates, and the other burgesses were equally with him compelled to renounce their functions.

It was on this occasion that Mr. Denman nobly returned the fee of 300 guineas which had been paid to him; and not content with this act of munificent liberality, he would not suffer his clients to pay for his lodgings, nor even to give the usual fee to his clerk, which in this instance would have amounted to above five-and-thirty pounds. On conduct such as this it were superfluous to make a remark. Every right-minded man will, however, rejoice that one of so noble a nature has been raised to the highest dignity which the common law can confer on a subject.

We have not as yet made any remark either on the parliamentary or judicial manner of the Chief Justice. We shall now proceed to do so as succinctly as possible. The figure of Lord Denman is tall, graceful, and commanding. His deportment is singularly dignified and

gentlemanlike, and his fine, full, rich, and deeply-toned voice, joined to the pallor of his countenance, give to his words and manner a solemnity and earnestness which must always stand him in good stead as a public speaker. His periods are full and sonorous, abounding with a rich and classic diction; but they are sometimes too much overlaid by a profusion of words, and occasionally it must be admitted by a paucity of thought. The declamation of the Chief Justice, especially when he warms on a subject, is glowing and eloquent; and always aided by the graces of a distinct and solemnly measured delivery. Sometimes, perhaps, this very solemnity lays his lordship open to the imputation of monotony, but this is a reproach which does not often attach to his style of public speaking. He has little claim to the merit of a debater, for his efforts were usually prepared; and as little to the praise of very varied and general information, though he is undoubtedly a man of elegant literature, and deeply imbued with a classic spirit. In the Lords he will no doubt afford considerable assistance to Lord Brougham, but neither the one nor the other of these noble lords, or both combined, are at all a match for Lord Lyndhurst. The subtlety, the quickness, the lucid clearness, the logical acumen, the boldness, and at the same time the dexterous prudence and downright solid-headedness of the Chief Baron, render him more than a match for any man in England.

Many opinions have been expressed on the impropriety of granting this Peerage to the Chief Justice of the King's Bench. If the creation could be defended at all—which we think it cannot—it might surely be best defended by looking to the character of the man. The “highest in rank and in merit” may be well proud to admit one of nature's nobles into the Herald's College of their nobility. Lord Denman may indeed confer honour on the peerage, but the peerage can confer no honour on him; and when we look to the number of mushroom titles which the law has lately supplied, we are sorry to find the name of Denman among them. To sustain the high rank of a British Peer a large income is indispensable, and when we consider the large family and the liberal expenditure of the present Chief Justice, we must ever lament that he has placed his descendants in a position of perilous eminence, in which they may have abundant rank; but let it be remembered that rank without riches is one of those honourable appendages which greatly encumbers the wearer.

#### BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF CONTROVERSY.

HOWEVER some may affect to dread controversy, it can never be of ultimate disadvantage to the interests of truth, or the happiness of mankind. Where it is indulged in its full extent, a multitude of ridiculous opinions, will, no doubt, be obtruded upon the public; but any ill influence they may produce cannot continue long, as they are sure to be opposed with at least equal ability, and that superior advantage which is ever attendant on truth. The colours with which wit or eloquence may have adorned a false system will gradually die away, sophistry be detected, and every thing estimated at length according to its true value. Publications, besides, like every thing else that is human, are of a mixed nature, where truth is often blended with falsehood, and important hints suggested in the midst of much impertinent or pernicious manner; nor is there any way of separating the precious from the vile, but by tolerating the whole. Where the right of unlimited inquiry is exerted, the human faculties will be upon the advance; where it is relinquished, they will be of necessity at a stand, and will probably decline.—*Robert Hall.*

## CONCLUSION OF THE GENERAL REVIEW OF OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS IN EUROPE.

---

WE resume our exposition of the Foreign Policy of England at the point at which we left off in our last : but though this is the third Number through which this article has extended, we feel that it is far from being exhausted; and instead of apologizing to our readers for its length, we have rather to ask their indulgence for the rapidity and brevity with which many of the points have been sketched. The truth is, that the pressure of our difficulties at home, has made us almost indifferent to the state of our Foreign Relations : but that is an additional reason why the public attention should be called to the subject; for if the Foreign Secretary neglects his duty, the only chance of recalling him to activity is by enlisting public opinion, and by the operation of that on the Government and the Legislature, stimulating both to a more careful and vigorous policy than has hitherto been observed.

We have so recently entered into the state and prospects of Russia at some length, first in an article published in the 33d Number of this REVIEW, published during the Recess, and continued in the 34th, and secondly in a still more recent article, entitled "Oppressions, Crimes, and Intrigues of Russia," that we do not see any necessity for detaining the reader long in that part of our inquiry devoted to Russia itself; more especially as we mean to enter into the question more at large in the concluding observations on Mr. Sheil's recent motion. The present is, however, the fitting opportunity to remark that the so called settlement of Europe, in 1814, brought Russia still more within the bosom of the European family. A piratical convention of three sovereigns, who each agreed to dismember and divide an independent kingdom, brought her from the Borysthenes to the Vistula, in 1762. The measures of the Congress of Vienna as well as the shameful apathy of Europe will infallibly place her Czar on the throne of the Western Emperors, as it has already given him a direct influence even beyond the Rhine. The oriental submission of her numerous people to the inflexible will of one master will achieve for her all that a despot can desire. The wise men of this world placed her frontier within twenty-four hours' march of Stockholm, and within the same distance of Eastern Prussia; and they allow her to touch on another side Austrian Poland. By her late successes before Warsaw, she may more than ever call the Vistula her own. Burke said, long ago, that the first partition of Poland would cause Europe to weep bitter tears of repentance; and it may with equal truth be averred that the last settlement of Vienna will have the same effect.

The first grand mistake of the European powers was, in not erecting Poland into a separate kingdom. Had Sarmatia been constituted as

such with her ancient limits, Russia, instead of being to-day an European would have been an Asiatic power. *Sed Diis aliter visum.* The second mistake of the Powers was nearer our own time, because committed by the present rulers of England and France. Had effective aid been rendered to Poland in her heroic struggle, in 1831, Turkey would have been saved from Russian protection; Germany would have been relieved from Russian influence; France would have made some progress in real freedom; and England would have been blessed and loved among the nations. But again our rulers were at fault, and their blindness, ignorance, and stupidity, have brought on us a heap of difficulties, from which they are not the men to extricate the world.

We now come to the crisis in the East, in the consideration of which we shall glance at the conduct of England and France on the one hand, and that of Russia and Austria on the other. Here too will be the season to make a few observations on the debate of Monday, the 17th of March, in the House of Commons.

That the Turkish empire was destined to fall speedily, every man of the least forethought might have perceived. That it was destined to fall so immediately as it appears to be on the point of doing, no human foresight could have discovered. We will not conceal that in the abstract, the extinction of so effete a despotism would be a consummation to be desired.—Could a better government be provided for Turkey it would have been desirable to have lent no helping hand to the throne of the Sultan; but when the question is narrowed to the point—as in effect it is so narrowed—of the substitution of Russian for Turkish despotism—the case of Turkey is invested with an extrinsic interest, which it does not, perhaps, of itself claim. This is the question which an English minister should ask himself: Is it better for the world, and for the Turks themselves, that a Sultan should govern at Constantinople than a Czar? Here is really the cream of the subject in a single interrogatory, and there can be no difficulty in answering such a query in the affirmative. Neither improvement, nor liberty, nor civilization, follow in the wake of Russian conquests; the Turk would be as much a slave under Nicholas as under Mahmoud, while he would become, as well as his Calmuc master, infinitely more dangerous to civilized Europe. The countries already taken from Turkey by Russia, are less happy, less prosperous, and we will add, even less free, than they were under their old masters. When the affair is viewed as touching on the independence of nations, and violating that equilibrium which statesmen call the “balance of power,” becomes more serious. From the history of the Turkish Wars to the peace of Bucharest, in 1812, it must have been evident to our Ministers (if indeed they had ever read of these wars, or considered the provisions of the Treaty) that the Turks were wholly unable to cope with a civilized enemy. Interested as we were, and are, in resisting the aggrandizement of Russia on national, as well as general grounds, it became imperative on us, from the moment Ibrahim Pasha obtained the vantage-ground, to have taken the initiative in the affairs of the East, and to have preserved the integrity of the Ottoman Empire either by the interposition of our good offices and mediation with the Viceroy of Egypt, or by throwing around the Sultan the panoply of our power. In either case there

could have been no pretext for the interference of Russia, and Turkey might have been still saved. It is now well known that, had the Porte added the Pashalic of Acre to the Viceroyalty of Egypt, the war might have been stopped, and that this might have been brought about by our mediation, there seems not the least reason to question. In 1831, the Viceroy put his army in motion, under the command of his stepson. Acre was besieged, and speedily fell into the hands of Ibrahim. Soon after, the inhabitants of Syria furnished supplies to the Egyptian army, and the Christian population declared for the fortunate soldier. It was on the 7th of July the contest took place, which decided the fate of Syria. The defeat of the Turks, at Homs, gave the *coup de grâce* to the cause of the Sultan. Powerless himself, the Head of the Faithful now looked to England for assistance, though it had been previously offered him by Russia. The application was first made to our Minister at Constantinople, and subsequently M. Mavroa, the Turkish Chargé d'Affaires at Vienna, was sent to London to forward the demand. Though backed by the Russian Government, this application was refused by our Ministry. The apology of the *Edinburgh Review* was, that we had other more important affairs in hand, such as Portugal and Belgium! This hollow pretence we exposed at the time, in the 33d Number of THE PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW, and if we do not go over the same ground now, it is that we would spare ourselves the trouble of writing that which our readers may have by a reference to the Number alluded to. We have said that at this season Russia seconded the application of M. Maurojeni. That wily power was well aware that our Ministers were not awake to the exigency of the crisis, and her calculations of a refusal were to the letter fulfilled. For a time after this first refusal the Turks relaxed into their wonted indifference; but the advance of Ibrahim, and the murmurs of the Divan, at length awakened the Sultan to a second effort. Namik Pasha was now despatched to England, but a change of agency operated no change of policy in the English court. All that Namik could gain was the appointment of an ambassador. Lord Ponsonby was named to this post on the 9th of November, and he arrived at Constantinople in five months after his appointment, being exactly three months after the most important transactions were over! Between November and May, the last and most decisive battle of Koniah had been fought—Russian aid had been demanded, and General Mourairéff, the Russian plenipotentiary, had arrived at Constantinople! By many it may be imagined that during this period of culpable negligence our ambassador was receiving no salary, and that being three months too late he would not deign to take his allowance. They who lay this flattering unction to their souls know little of English diplomacy. Lord Ponsonby's quarterly salary was regularly paid, and he had received the amount of a considerable outfit allowed him for proceeding to a destination where he just arrived in time to be too late!

Admiral Roussin, the French ambassador, who had been appointed at the same time as Lord Ponsonby, arrived at Constantinople on the 17th of February. He insisted upon an immediate audience with the Reis-Effendi, which was granted him on the 19th. On the day after the solicited Russian squadron arrived in the Bosphorus. Roussin now declared to the Sultan that he should decline to disembark his effects till the Russian force was dismissed. The Sultan hesitated; but in

his demand Roussin went so far as to guarantee a treaty with Mehemet Ali upon the basis of the terms which Halil, the officer of the Sultan, had been instructed to propose at Alexandria. A convention was signed to this effect, in consequence of which the Porte engaged to renounce "all foreign assistance of whatever kind." The Russians were now requested to withdraw—but the Pasha refusing to "listen to the voice of the charmer" Roussin, unless Adana was ceded to him, (to which the French minister would not consent) the negotiation proved infructuous, and 20,000 Russians were disembarked on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus, with a notification from the Czar that his troops should not leave Turkey until Ibrahim and his army were behind the Taurus. It has been the fashion to call these proceedings of Admiral Roussin rash, but we confess they appear to us prompt and decided, and quite worthy of the French nation. The ambassador no doubt calculated on the support of his Government; but the French Ministry (although not disavowing the act of its ambassador) special-pleaded itself out of the dilemma with a sinister dexterity worthy of its eminently bad repute, and De Broglie sacrificed Roussin pretty much in the same fashion in which Sebastiani sacrificed Guilleminot.

At length the Sultan yielded to the necessity of making peace. Adana was eventually ceded to the Pasha of Egypt, and a Russian Commissioner having witnessed the evacuation of Kiutayah, and the retrograde march of Ibrahim, returned to announce the good tidings at Constantinople. On the day after the return of this welcome messenger, the Russian troops re-embarked in their vessels; and while the pœans, chanted in praise of the purity and loyalty of Nicholas, were still ringing in the ears of the diplomatic body at Pera, Count Orloff appears on the scene, is closeted with the Reis-Effendi and Sultan, and the result of these conferences is, that a treaty of reciprocal defence is concluded between Russia and Turkey. By a separate article, the Porte, *acting in the spirit of the treaty, and to promote its object, engages to close, in case of need, the Straits of the Dardanelles.* Thus the Ottoman Government binds itself not only in effect to have the same friends and enemies as Russia, but to close the Dardanelles against the vessels of every other country at the bidding of Nicholas! When it is considered, independently of this, that Turkey is indebted in a sum of nearly five millions to Russia—that the troops of the Czar are in possession of Wallachia and Moldavia—and that by the ninth article of the treaty of Adrianople, Russian vessels are never, under any pretext, to be visited or spoken to, or interfered with *in any way* by the Turkish authorities—and that Russian subjects at the Porte are placed under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Russian Minister—it is a gross misnomer to call Turkey an independent country; for the Russian monarch is at this moment as decidedly master at Constantinople as at Petersburg.

It was, therefore, with some reason that Mr. Sheil called for copies of any communications between his Majesty's Government and the Russian Government on the subject of this treaty. The hon. member for Tipperary supported his motion by a clear and succinct statement of facts. He contended, and justly contended, that the effect of this treaty would be, that the ships of all nations not at war with Turkey, *but at war with Russia*, would be excluded the Dardanelles; and

that at length the Muscovite, by the fraudulent diplomacy of Orloff, had attained the key of what he called "his own house," to the contingent prejudice of England. Lord Palmerston weakly replied to this, that the *casus fœderis* was not likely to arise; but hereupon Sir R. Peel triumphantly rejoined—

"True," said the noble lord, "but the *casus fœderis* is not likely to arise. It is exceedingly improbable that it ever should arise." *No doubt it was improbable that it would arise while we were at peace with Russia; but suppose a war should arise, would not Russia have the power of closing the Dardanelles against us, and if that should occur, the noble lord could only say that he had been a false prophet, and that the thing had fallen out very differently from what he had reason to expect. The noble lord had said that he was glad to find that Russia had taken that part; but the moment he said that, it was in vain for him to lament the consequences to which it might lead. (Cheers.) If we admitted that Russia was the only power which could afford that protection at the time, we had no right to blame Russia, as the cause of the destruction of Turkey's independence as a state. After our long jealousy of the encroachments of Russia—after our long-continued fears as to her rivalry of us with respect to Turkey—after our repeated intimations that she should not be permitted to carry her encroachments beyond a certain point—if after all this we were to admit that Russia was the only power which could occupy Constantinople as a friend, it would be quite as decisive of the independence of Turkey as if Russia had occupied it as an enemy. (Hear.)*

This debate will be memorable in the annals of England. Never were stronger arguments urged by an Opposition, or weaker by a Ministry. Even Mr. Stanley, with all his talent, could not rescue the Foreign Secretary from his dilemma. If there was a treaty (and that was not denied), we were to rely more on the diplomatic assurances of Russia than on the recorded stipulations, signed, sealed, and ratified, between two powers, in the teeth of our commercial and maritime interests.

Of this humiliating treaty we shall soon see the bitter fruits. If it be allowed to subsist—if England permit the Dardanelles to be closed against her ships—then Russia, secure from attack in the Euxine, may have the game all her own way, and play it unmolested, not only in the East but in the West, not only in the North but in the South. Thus will her long-devised schemes be accomplished half a century sooner than her rulers supposed.\*

Ay, but say the ministerial writers, all this may be very true, and doubtless it is very bad, but an alliance between England and France will set all to rights. Gentlemen, England and France *called themselves* allied during the whole of these negotiations, and behold the splendid result! And while we now write, looking to the *eminent success* of the mission to negotiate a commercial treaty—looking also to the reception given by Louis-Philippe and his Cabinet to Lord Durham and Mr. Ellice—and to the frequent and early interviews which have taken place during the last two months between the King of the Bar-

\* In 1808, immediately after the interview at Erfurt, at that period of great intimacy between the Cabinets of Paris and Petersburg, Alexander insisted upon a division of the Ottoman Empire. To tempt the French Government, the concessions proposed to it were immense—the Spanish Peninsula—the Italian—an ascendancy over Germany—Bosnia, Albania, the Morea, and the islands depending upon that Empire. Troops were even offered to make a conquest of these, but in compensation for the part allotted to Russia, the Emperor demanded that Constantinople and the Dardanelles should be comprised.—See on this subject the revelations of M. Bignon, in his speech in the Chamber of Deputies.



ricades and M. Pozzo di Borgo, is it very unreasonable to conclude that a proposition, not widely different from that of 1808, should be made by the Russian to the French Government in 1834? Is it very unlikely that Russia should say, "Let me do what I like with Constantinople, and you shall have your wicked will with Belgium and Algiers." Propositions of this kind may account for some of the indifference that prevails in the French councils as to a Commercial Treaty; and for the whole of that apathy of late perceptible in French remonstrances to the East. These are at least views of the question on which reasonable men may be allowed to hang doubts—and they are at all events views which we had rather see answered by facts, than vain attempts at argument and declamation!

In the present article we had hoped to say somewhat on the system of Dragomans, as still employed in the English Chancery at Pera—and also on the social condition of France in reference to England and Europe—but we find we have so exceeded the limits that we had proposed to ourselves, that we must stop short and postpone the observation on our agents at the Porte, till Mr. H. L. Bulwer's motion on the Diplomacy of England is under discussion. The observations on the Social and Political Condition of France will form at an early day an appropriate suite to the present article.

#### WHATEVER IS GOOD WILL ALWAYS BEAR INVESTIGATION.

EVERY thing that is really excellent will bear examination, it will even invite it, and the more narrowly it is surveyed, to the more advantage it will appear. Is our constitution a good one? it will gain in our esteem by the severest inquiry. Is it bad? then its imperfection should be laid open and exposed. Is it, as is generally confessed, of a mixed nature, excellent in theory, but defective in its practice? freedom of discussion will be still requisite to point out the nature and source of its corruptions, and apply suitable remedies. If our constitution be that perfect model of excellence it is represented, it may boldly appeal to the reason of an enlightened age, and need not rest on the support of an implicit faith.—*Robert Hall.*

#### STEAM POWER IN LIEU OF HORSES.

THE funds for the maintenance of labour receive their greatest possible increase, when, in the working of machines, horse power is superseded. In this case, human subsistence is augmented, not only by the extension of tillage rendered practicable by the reduction in the cost of production, but also by the whole quantity of produce which the horses formerly consumed. This most important augmentation in the supply of human subsistence has now commenced. Already in this country steam is superseding horses, and it is scarcely possible to measure the extent to which this supplanting process may be carried. In a few years draught horses may disappear from all the great lines of traffic throughout England; and it seems not improbable, that at no distant period the plough and the harrow will be moved by steam, as well as the carriage and the waggon. Upon the funds for the maintenance of labour, the substitution of steam for cattle will have the same effect as that which would be produced by doubling the fertility of the soil. There will be an unprecedented increase in the demand for labour; double the number of people may be employed at the same wages, or the same number at double wages.—*Colonel Torrens.*

## LORD BROUGHAM'S SPEECH ON THE STATE AND PROSPECTS OF EDUCATION.

---

It is not often that we meet with any thing of sufficient interest to induce us to devote any portion of our pages to a report of what transpires in the House of Lords. When such an event does happen, however, we are glad to record it : and in this spirit we think it necessary to advert to the speech of Lord Brougham, delivered on Wednesday, April 16, in the House of Lords. The occasion of the speech was on a motion for certain returns connected with the charitable institutions, including those for gratuitous education, in several of the counties of England and Wales. The subject of the speech was a review of the state and progress of Education in the parts of the country referred to, and a discussion of the comparative merits and defects of the voluntary and compulsory system.

It appeared, from returns obtained, in answers to circulars addressed to about 500 different parishes, that both in the agricultural and manufacturing districts, day schools, and Sunday schools, had each increased in number to a great extent, and that the scholars actually under daily and weekly tuition were nearly doubled. It was admitted that it was mainly through the voluntary exertions of the Dissenters that this increase in the number of schools and pupils had taken place : and it was therefore inferred that this was a powerful argument against the voluntary system of Education maintained by private and voluntary subscriptions. The principal, if not the only objection raised to the compulsory system of Education, was this : that it could not be carried on, without a rate or tax being levied for the purpose of raising the funds, in each particular county or parish, and this, it was said, would lessen the inclination of the persons on whom it should be levied, to pay any further voluntary subscriptions, and thus the voluntary system would be altogether destroyed.

We confess that our surprise is scarcely less than our regret at reading such a speech and hearing such arguments from Lord Brougham ; and as, from his high station and great name, much weight will be attached to his statements, we deem it necessary to show wherein we conceive them to be fallacious.

In the first place, as to the increase of schools and scholars, under the present system, being taken as a proof that the system is really good. This is a fallacy which Lord Brougham has so often exposed, in political opposition to those who contended that *because* Great Britain had become more wealthy and powerful and intelligent under the old system of boroughmongering, *therefore* the system was excellent, that we are astonished at his own blindness in the present instance. The increase of schools and scholars might have been tenfold greater if national provision had been made, and parents had been compelled to send their children to schools provided at the public expense.

There has been an increase, *notwithstanding* the want of aid from the State; as there was national prosperity *notwithstanding* the corrupt state of the representation; but these effects had happened, not *because* of the absence of state aid in the one case, or the influence of corrupt boroughs in the other, but *in spite* of them; and would each have been tenfold greater but for the drawbacks adverted to.

In the second place, it was said, that though the people of Ireland and Scotland readily sent their children to the schools that were opened for them in these parts of the kingdom, the people of England would be backward in so doing, even were the opportunities presented to them; and those who should be called upon to pay the school-rate, or local tax for supporting such schools, would refuse to pay it on the ground that the schools were without pupils, and consequently useless. Now all this is mere speculation. The experiment has not been tried, to see whether English parents would be more or less backward than Irish and Scotch to profit by such an advantage or not; and it is wholly gratuitous assumption to say that the school-rate would be complained of on account of a supposed inutility which yet remains to be proved.

But we do not see the necessity of putting the rate system to the test at all. There is no necessity for raising the funds by any such mode. People are not specially and parochially assessed for a ship-rate or a regiment-rate to maintain the navy and army, because both are *national*, and paid out of the general revenue. Neither need there be a schoolhouse rate, or a teacher's-rate, if the cost of Education be made national, like the support of the navy and army. Schools and dwellings can be built as easily as ships, barracks, and fortifications; and masters and ushers can be procured as readily as gunners, sergeants and corporals; and each can be equally paid out of the general revenue; since all classes are interested in the general result.

The rule, we think, in all matters of taxation, should be this: Whatever is for the general welfare, should be supported out of the general revenue;—and in this we should include, defence from external aggression, and, consequently, all our armed force:—preservation of internal tranquillity, including all our judicial and police establishments;—internal communication, including all our public roads;—support of the maimed and helpless, as well as the indigent poor, including all hospitals, workhouses, &c.—and national education, including the teaching of every human being, from five to ten years of age. All these being of *general* concern, should be paid for out of the *general* revenue; and local rates should be raised for and applied to those objects only which are purely local, and cannot affect any other than particular places—such, especially, as paving, lighting, cleansing, improving, or beautifying particular districts or towns; such as the conveyance of passengers and letters, the establishment of local institutions, and matters affecting only those who enjoy the privileges conferred by them, for which the participants, and the participants only, of these benefits, should pay. In all such cases, local and special rates are proper, because the benefits are local; but in all the former, the general revenue of the country should bear the burden, because the whole community are benefitted by the perfection of the objects supported. And since persons are *compelled* to pay the taxes for carrying

on a war, for preserving the colonies, for supporting the pomp of courts, and the power of the judicial tribunals, whether they approve of the naval and military battles that are fought—of the administration of our colonies—of the expense of our courts—and of the uncertainty and delay of justice or not—upon all which subjects there will be a great diversity of opinion—we cannot conceive why men should not be also *compelled* to pay rates or taxes for the support of a National System of Education, as to the benefits of which to those who are so happy as to be embraced in it, and to society at large, there is scarcely any doubt whatever.

As to the dislike which parents might have to send their children to school, or the aversion which the children themselves might have to go, this surely ought not to weigh for a moment against the importance of compelling both to do their duty. Lord Brougham says,

It was not to be supposed that education could be placed on a very secure or solid foundation, in a country containing a population of 14,000,000 or 15,000,000, when the system depended so much upon *casual aid*. Probably, however, the Legislature—for the attention of the country had of late been strongly directed to this point—would take up the subject, and place the system of education on a more solid basis. The voluntary principle should, however, always be adhered to,—nothing like compulsion should enter into the system. In Prussia the contrary course was pursued. Education was forced under the rigour of military punishment—under the dread of the sergeant—under the fear of the corporal. Now, he did not think that any one measure could be devised by the mind of man, so nicely, so admirably calculated to make a system of education unpopular, as that of compelling people to send their children to school. He was therefore decidedly adverse to the introduction of a compulsory system in any sense whatever, either by forcing parents to send their children to school under certain penalties, or depriving them of certain privileges if they refused to let them attend. A knowledge of the benefits that were to be derived from education—a knowledge of its great usefulness in every rank and condition of life, ought to be the great incitement to seek it; and every effort ought to be made to disseminate that leading principle, in order that all might profit by it. As to another species of compulsion—that of a rate—he would not consent to it; for he would never sanction any proposition which coupled the word “education” with the word “rate.” He thought that the best course that could be pursued was, instead of introducing any bill, to try a little more experience on the subject. By instituting small seminaries,—by founding normal schools, for the education of schoolmasters, aided by the liberality of Parliament, he thought much might be done; and he had great hopes that this session would not be suffered to pass without some attempt being made to take up these points in an enlightened spirit. Sure he was, that such an attempt would be successful.

This is a very strange passage. It is admitted that *casual aid* is insufficient. It is admitted that the Legislature *should* interfere. It is even recommended that it should grant *money* for support of the schools, and yet in the same breath, the idea of a “rate” being paid for Education is condemned! Surely this is a mere play upon words. The 20,000*l.*, or 50,000*l.* voted by Parliament, must come from the pockets of the people, by whatever method it may be raised: and as this admits the principle of supporting a system of National Education by payments from the National Funds, all we desire is to see the principle carried out to its fullest extent, and a million a year applied at once, and as much more as may be necessary hereafter, to found so general and complete a system of Education, and such ample machinery for carrying it into execution, as that every child in the kingdom between the ages of

five and ten might be able to obtain Education at the national expense, if their parents were unable to defray the cost. The dread of the sergeant and the fear of the corporal is not so strong in the schools of Prussia, as the dread of the master and the fear of the usher at Eton and Winchester: and the rigour of military discipline, observed in the Prussian schools, is not half so severe as the system of flogging and flogging observed in our public schools in England. If we wait until uneducated parents are sufficiently satisfied of the advantages of Education, to send their children voluntarily, or until the children themselves shall flock of their own accord to the public schools as places of amusement and pleasure, we shall wait as long as the physician would be obliged to do if he kept back his prescriptions until his patients, old and young, were so enamoured of his disagreeable draughts and pills as to take them without their being prescribed. But, with the strangest inconsistency imaginable, we compel persons to do and pay for that which is nationally *mischievous*, and seize their goods and sell them when they refuse, as is the case with the Quakers, who will neither pay war taxes nor tithes; and yet we shrink from compelling persons to do and pay for that which we admit to be *beneficial*, and which no human being ever yet repented having been compelled to receive—education and instruction in all the useful branches of knowledge.

If a parent were to see its child suffering under some fatal bodily disease, and were to refuse to let the physician of the town, or village administer gratuitously the medicine of the public dispensary for its cure, such parent would be condemned as a most inhuman monster; and if the child perished in consequence of such refusal, the causer of the death would be justly subject to punishment. But the diseases of the mind are far more fatal than those of the body: and ignorance is the most fruitful source of such diseases. If the State is bound to furnish preventatives to the cholera or the plague, to establish quarantine and medical boards to preserve the physical health of the country, it is equally bound to prevent mental and moral contagion, and to check the spread of ignorance, as the parent of almost every crime. And if individuals are bound to take such remedies for physical diseases as are prescribed, and submit to such restrictions as are enjoined for the public health, so ought they to be equally compelled to conform to such regulations as may be necessary to enforce Education on all who might be reluctant to receive it (which, however, would be few), and to punish with suitable penalties all those who threw obstacles in the way of its being received and enjoyed by all.

It could easily be shown that religion, morality, peace, justice, and every attribute of sound policy, enjoins this duty of Universal Education on every Government pretending to seek the happiness of its subjects as the chief end of its rule: and it might be as clearly proved that the strictest and truest economy would justify a very large expenditure for this purpose, to save the enormous cost which ignorance, and its concomitants, intemperance and crime, daily inflict upon the country: but we have said enough to induce our readers to reflect upon the subject, and draw their own conclusions.

## LORD ALTHORP'S SPEECH ON THE NEW SYSTEM OF THE POOR LAWS.

On Thursday, the 17th, there was a very full attendance of members to hear the expected statement of Lord Althorp, as to the alteration intended to be proposed in the Poor Laws. The noble lord seemed determined to redeem himself, after the exceedingly imperfect manner in which he had acquitted himself on the Tithe question; and rising greatly above his usual standard, he delivered himself on the Poor Law question with more readiness, decision, and perspicuity, than on any former occasion within our recollection. The speech is so good, and the proposed amendments of the Poor Laws so important, that we feel it our duty to the subject, and to our readers, to give the speech entire.

The approbation with which this speech was received was greater and more general than any that we remember during the present Session. Sir George Strickland, Colonel Torrens, Mr. E. L. Bulwer, Mr. Hume, Mr. Hardy, Colonel Wood, Mr. Ward, Sir Thomas Fremantle, Mr. Slaney, and Sir Samuel Whalley, each spoke in approval of the general measure: at which Lord Althorp expressed his extreme satisfaction; and the unanimity was so great that very little opposition is likely to be made to the measure in its progress.

Lord ALTHORP, in rising to call the attention of the house to the existing laws for the relief of the poor in England, said that most undoubtedly the motion which he was about to introduce for the consideration of the house was one of as great importance as any that had ever been submitted to its notice. (Hear, hear.) The present state of the poor laws of this country had long been a subject that had occupied the attention and engaged the minds of the ablest men in it, and various attempts had been made from time to time by persons very conversant with their operation and effects to amend those laws, to remedy the evils, and to correct the abuses engendered by them, but hitherto unfortunately all such attempts had uniformly not succeeded. Such was the state in which his Majesty's Ministers, when they came into office, found the present system of poor laws. They found that for many years complaints had been made as to the mode in which the administration of the poor laws had affected every class more immediately connected with or interested in it—the landed proprietors, the farmers, the occupiers of the soil, and the poor themselves; they found that the administration of the poor laws had been injurious in its operation to every one of those classes, but that, most of all, they had been injurious to the labouring classes themselves. (Hear.) Such being the case, his Majesty's Ministers thought it their imperative duty, as a Government, to apply themselves at once to this question, and to consider what course they ought to pursue with a view to remedy the evils connected with it—evils of long standing, and of serious injury to the country at large. After giving the subject that consideration which its importance demanded, they felt that the best course to adopt in the first instance was to issue a commission of inquiry. There had been already, they were well aware, many committees of inquiry in that house upon the subject, and a great mass of information had been in that way collected with regard to it. But such a mode of proceeding, it was obvious, always carried this defect along with it—that all such

information being collected from gentlemen who had come up generally as volunteers to give evidence on the subject, each prepared with his own particular system as the grand remedy that ought to be adopted, it was greatly deficient in facts, while it was abundantly filled with opinions and theories as to the operation and effects of the poor laws. (Hear.) They had collected a vast deal of valuable information as to opinions on the subject, but not so much as to the facts connected with it; yet the latter species of information was by far the more important of the two, and was indeed indispensably necessary to guide the Legislature to any thing like a safe and sound system of reformation. (Hear.) Under those circumstances, his Majesty's Government thought that clearly the best mode was to issue a commission to make inquiries in the country districts of the south, in order to ascertain what was the cause why in some parts of the country the poor laws were considered a benefit by parishes, while in others their operation had been ruinous and destructive, and why in some agricultural districts certain parishes existed in which the poor laws appeared to do no harm at all. In issuing such a commission of inquiry his Majesty's Government conceived that this benefit (no small one) would at all events be reaped from its labours—that having a general view of the state of the poor laws and of their administration, and a large body of important facts connected with that administration, thus laid before the country, those parishes throughout the kingdom where injurious effects had arisen from their operation might profit by the experiments made in other parishes where different effects had followed, and might adopt the improvements which the examples of such parishes suggested to them.

He would confess that he himself had been one of those who, in the first instance, thought that the experiment of issuing a commission would be able to carry them nothing further than this, which, however, he conceived would be in itself effecting a great benefit for the country—namely, the exhibiting the proofs how an improved management had produced an improved state of the poor laws in certain parishes, while in others bad management had been productive of the most calamitous results. (Hear, hear.) He was ready to admit that, having experienced the inutility of so many attempts of the Legislature to remedy the defects and abuses of the poor laws, he had not been sanguine that by any legislative enactment we should be likely to attain that desirable end. It was under these circumstances, and with a view to guide the Legislature in its decision on this important subject, that the commission of inquiry had been issued, and he was sure he was fully borne out in saying that the report of that commission was a most valuable document. (Hear, hear.) It had shown to the whole country what was the state and operation of the poor laws in different parts of it. It had shown to the country what great improvements might be made in that state by exhibiting the trial and consequences of alterations and improvements in the administration of the poor laws in various parishes, while it furnished at the same time a frightful picture of the horror and misery occasioned in other parishes by the mismanagement of those laws. He thought that even in that respect, leaving other considerations for the present out of account, the report of the commissioners would be productive of the greatest advantage to the country, and to no class in it more so than to the labouring population itself. (Hear, hear.) He believed that, in fact, it had been already productive of such good effects; he believed that the report of the commissioners—that was to say, the abstract of the evidence collected by them, that had been published last session—had already operated in the most beneficial manner. It had been disseminated throughout the country; gentlemen in various districts had profited by the examples and facts which it furnished, and already improvements in the administration of the poor laws had been effected in several parishes. He must say, however, that the principal advantage produced by the report of the commissioners was this—that it had exhibited such a picture of the bad effects of the poor laws in many districts of the country, that he did think it had now become the bounden duty of the Legislature to interfere and endeavour to remedy an evil fraught with the most destructive consequences to the whole community.

He had already said that the effects of the poor laws had been injurious to the landed proprietors, injurious to the farmers, and above all injurious to the labour-

ing population. He would now assert, and he would appeal to the facts detailed in the report of the commissioners for the confirmation of what he stated, that the effect of the poor laws tended directly—he meant to say, that the present administration of the poor laws tended directly—to the destruction of all property in the country. (Hear.) It had been said that this would lead to an agrarian law—it would be worse than that. An agrarian law was the division of property, but the present state of the poor laws in this country tended to the destruction of all property. (Hear, hear.) He could not conceive anything more fatal to the very class for whose benefit those laws had been enacted than to allow them to go on in their present destructive course, without an attempt on the part of the Legislature to put a check on them. (Hear, hear.) He begged, however, that in making that statement he should not be understood as expressing his disapprobation of a well-regulated system of poor laws. (Hear, hear.) So far from that being the case, he was of opinion that a well-regulated system of poor laws would be productive of great benefit to the country. (Hear, hear.) He was aware that he was now expressing an opinion contrary to the more strict principles of political economy. Indeed, those principles went further, for they even prohibited the exercise of private charity itself. The more strict principles of political economy laid it down that every man should be left to provide his own subsistence by his own labour—that he must know what his family cost—that he alone should provide for them—and that he ought to provide for the calamities which sickness and misfortune might bring upon him out of his previous savings. Such was the doctrine of political economy. But as long as we were accessible, not only to the feelings of religion, but to the dictates of humanity, we must be convinced that the support of those who were really helpless, and really unable to provide for themselves, was not only justifiable, but a sacred duty on our parts. (Cheers.) It was therefore to the abuses of the system of poor laws, not to the system itself—it was to the bad administration of those laws, not to their principle—that he objected. For a long period of years the administration of the poor laws was free from the evils and abuses now connected with it.

He believed that he was correct in stating that the present bad effects experienced from the administration of the poor laws dated their commencement from about the beginning of the present century, and that they originated in measures intended for the benefit of that class of the community—the labouring population—to whose interests and welfare they were now most destructively opposed. A feeling at that period had got abroad that discontent existed amongst the working classes of the country, and a principle was then adopted in legislation, which though no doubt well intended, and though it might be said to be a very humane principle, had been productive of the most baneful effects. He was now alluding to the 36th Geo. III., in which the principle was laid down, that the relief to paupers ought to be given in such a manner as to place them in a situation of comfort. Now, however we might wish to place all our countrymen in a situation of comfort, to give such relief as that described in this statute was, he considered, the duty of private charity, and should not be provided for by a compulsory rate. (Hear, hear.) The effect of this law was to give the magistrates the power of ordering relief to be given to the poor in their own dwellings. That had been followed up by the magistrates acting upon the same principle, which was so consistent with every good feeling of human nature that it was impossible to blame them, and yet it was a great mistake, though originating undoubtedly, as he had already said, in the best feelings that animate mankind. The consequence of it had been to lead from bad to worse. All feelings of independence on the part of the labourers had been almost entirely extinguished in many parts of the country, and the result had been, that instead of placing the paupers in a state of comfort, we had placed all the labouring population in many districts of the country in a state of deplorable misery and distress. (Hear, hear.) That the present was a question of extreme difficulty no one who had given it the slightest or the most cursory attention could for a moment doubt. The length of time during which the operation of this system had been going on, in its consequences producing throughout whole districts of the country that distress which it was intended to relieve, rendered it impossible to expect that at



once, or by any rapid measure of legislation, we should endeavour to counteract the evils engendered by it.

The greatest caution was undoubtedly necessary in dealing with such a question, at the same time the present system could not be allowed to continue. The consequences to which it tended were so frightful—the dangers which they incurred by leaving it as it was were so urgent and so great, that they were bound boldly to meet the difficulties of the case, and, while they acted with the utmost caution, to adopt right principles, and unflinchingly carry them into execution. (Hear, hear.) They had the advantage in legislating on this question now, that they were not working entirely in the dark, because in many parishes in the country a good system in the administration of the poor laws had been already adopted and acted upon. They could see how the system, improved and well regulated, had worked in those parishes; they could see the advantages which had been there derived from it, and they were thus enabled to refer to experiments already made to guide them elsewhere in the work of reformation. He was ready to admit that it did not follow, that because such experiments, tried in isolated and individual parishes, had been successful, that therefore the same alterations if adopted all over the country would be attended with equal success. It was obvious, therefore, that to legislate successfully on this subject, to benefit by the examples set before us and the experiments which we now witnessed in successful operation, we must act gradually, introduce the improved system into different parishes step by step, ascertaining its effects as we went along, and thus more certainly ensure its final success. He was aware that in recommending such a plan Government were recommending the adoption of an unusual course of legislation, but it appeared to them the one best calculated to meet the various difficulties of the case. He believed that the number of parishes in which the improved system had been already either entirely or partially adopted amounted to 100.

The noble lord here rapidly ran over a list of the different counties, with the number of parishes in each of which the improved system had been adopted. Amongst them he stated the following:—That in Berkshire it had been adopted in two parishes; in Buckinghamshire, in two, in Cornwall, in two; in Devonshire, in one; in Dorsetshire, in one; in Hertfordshire, in three; in Lancashire, in one; in Nottinghamshire, in one; in Norfolk, in 54; in Suffolk, in 24; and in Brecon, in one parish. It appeared, therefore, that the experiment had been tried in every part of the country—in some districts even that had been entirely pauperized, and in every one of them, he believed, the experiment had succeeded as far as it had been already tried. Notwithstanding that such facts would justify them in acting on such an experiment, so generally and in so many different places tried with success, yet still he would say that they should proceed with the greatest caution, if they should attempt in an act of Parliament to fix a time when an alteration of the present system should take place, they might find themselves placed in this difficulty—that it might be fit to direct a change of the system at an earlier period in some parishes than others; that in some districts of the country, though the evils inseparable from the present system had already begun to show themselves, they had not yet reached the height they had in others, and certainly it would be impossible at once to apply the same system to parishes almost pauperized, and parishes where the evil was not so pressing, nor the distress so great. The course which, under such circumstances, he was about to recommend to the house for its adoption was, he was free to admit, an anomalous one, and one which went to vest great and extensive power in the commission which it was proposed to appoint. He would only ask the house to consider the alternative which they had between the measure he now proposed and leaving things as they were. He would again entreat the attention of the house to the frightful consequences of the present system, if it should be allowed to go on as it was proceeding. (Hear, hear.) If it should proceed in its course of destruction for the future as rapidly as it had hitherto done, and that rapidity was likely as it went to be accelerated, what would be the result? At present some parishes had been actually abandoned, so heavy was the pressure of the rates, and so great the evils of mismanagement. The consequence was, that the neighbouring parishes were compelled to support their poor; they, too, would soon be reduced

to a similar situation, and this pauperism would stride with increased and every-day increasing rapidity throughout the land. (Hear, hear.) He felt justified therefore, under the circumstances, in submitting the present measure to the house. It was a measure he conceived at all events grounded upon prudence and caution. It was absolutely necessary that there should be a discretionary power vested somewhere. It was obvious, he repeated, that a discretionary power must be vested in some quarter to carry into effect recommendations calculated, he hoped, to introduce sound principles and the fruits of salutary experience into the administration of the poor laws. The principal subject then for them to consider was, where that discretionary power should be placed. If they vested it in the local authorities, or in the local magistracy, however well intentioned they might be, deprived as they would be of those sources of general information and comparison open to a board of commissioners, and however excellent their motives, biassed as they must be by local prejudices and local feelings, it was plain that such a quarter would not be the fittest one to invest with a discretionary power for carrying the measure into effect. It was therefore his intention to propose that His Majesty should be authorized to appoint a central board of commissioners, vested with such power for that purpose. There was one part of the administration of the poor laws which, however difficult it might be to effect, yet was essentially necessary, but without which no discretionary power ought to be extended, and that was, to fix a day (and that day he should propose in the measure he sought to introduce to be in one of the summer months of the next year, when the agricultural labourers would of course be in full employment), when the allowance system, as it was called, should entirely and altogether cease. (Hear, hear.) He was aware of the great difficulties which might be suggested to this proposition, but having for many years acted as a magistrate in a county in which the allowance system had been adopted, from his own experience of its operation, he was perfectly satisfied that so long as that system was permitted to exist, it would be impossible to carry into effect any suggested improvement, or to bring the poor laws into a better condition. (Hear, hear.)

The present was not the first time by many that he had advocated such a measure in his place in Parliament, for the purpose of preventing persons employed by individuals receiving parochial relief. He had supported a bill which had been repeatedly brought before the house by his hon. friend the member for Shrewsbury; indeed, he had ever thought that such was the first step necessary to bring the poor laws into a proper state. He begged the house to consider on what grounds it could be thought that such a change could produce that difficulty and danger which he had reason to believe was so feared by some hon. members. He admitted that at first sight the proposition might appear difficult to adopt, but it was well to bear in mind that the payment of labourers as much by the parish as was paid by their employers was, in many and innumerable instances, wholly derived from the parochial funds; so that the farmer gained an advantage which he ought not to gain—namely, that of receiving assistance for the payment of those whom he employed. (Hear, hear.) Against any difficulty which might be suggested against the abrogation of the allowance system he would set off the advantage to be derived by the farmer having the opportunity of obtaining independent labour, instead of men to be paid partly by the parish and partly by himself, and he thought the advantage would be found greatly to counterbalance the evils by some dreaded. He thought no man could doubt but that the change in the system would be productive of benefit and advantage to the labourers themselves. It was possible it might appear to some hon. gentlemen that the agricultural labourer, having at present an addition from the parochial funds to the amount of the wages paid by his employer (that addition being regulated according to the number of his family), the effect of taking away that assistance would make it impossible for him to maintain himself and family. He (Lord Althorp) did not think such would be the case, for he believed, nay, he felt confident, that as the labourer regarded the parochial assistance now added to the wages he received from his employer as making the total wages to which he was entitled for his labour and industry, a very short time would elapse after the

removal of that assistance before wages would rise to an equivalent amount, and as soon as that was the case, the situation in which the labourer would be placed was infinitely preferable to that in which he at present stood. (Hear, hear.) He repeated, therefore, that before it was possible successfully to proceed with the amendment of the present system of poor laws, whatever difficulty might appear, it was absolutely necessary to get rid of this most essential fault—the allowance system—a fault which was the foundation of almost all other evils arising from the existing system.

Having stated thus much, he again came to the consideration of the discretionary powers with which it would be necessary to vest the central commissioners. He need not say that an immense advantage would be obtained by the establishment of an uniformity of system throughout the country (hear), and therefore he proposed that the commissioners should have power to make general rules and orders as to the mode of relief and for the regulation of workhouses, and the mode of relief afforded therein. He admitted that these were great discretionary powers to be given to any body of men; but he should propose, as a check against any abuse, that any such rule, order, or regulation so proposed by the commissioners should be submitted to the Secretary of State, and remain forty days, before it could be brought into action; and during that period it should be competent for an order in council, issued for that purpose, to prevent it from being carried into effect. He observed some hon. gentlemen seemed to dissent to this portion of the proposition; he admitted that by this measure he was asking for extraordinary discretionary powers, but at the same time he must contend that it would be utterly impossible to carry an improvement in the present system of poor laws into effect without acting upon great discretionary powers. (Hear, hear.) If any hon. gentleman would find a better authority in whom to vest these powers, he should be happy to attend to any suggestion to that effect; but as he believed no better or more competent authority could be established, he hoped the objection would not be general in the house. (Hear, hear.) To return to the powers which he proposed to vest in the board of central commissioners: then powers would be to make the general rules and regulations subject to the approbation, or he should rather say, the non-disapprobation of the Secretary of State and the Government, in the manner he had already stated,—to have power to make specific rules and orders for the regulation and mode of relief of the poor in separate districts and parishes,—to form unions of parishes in order to make larger districts,—to arrange classifications of poor in the same workhouses, and also to have a general power of control in such unions as might be established without their consent, and to dissolve unions which might now exist. As to the unions when formed, each parish in such unions must maintain its own poor, or contribute to the general fund the proportion of expense which it had heretofore borne itself. He did not mean to say that it was not intended to empower individual parishes, if they so thought fit—that was to say, if the vestries in each parish should agree to such a proposition—to make a different arrangement, but he thought it was desirable that parishes should have power to unite for the purposes of parochial settlements, and for the poor rates altogether. Such a power, however, ought not to be vested in the vestries of parishes themselves, as such a body could not be considered competent to form satisfactorily or safely such unions.

He should also propose that the commissioners should have authority to suggest to parishes or unions of parishes the propriety of adding to their workhouses, or of building new workhouses, as circumstances might require. In the present state of the agricultural interest of this country, he should be sorry to place in the power of any body of men the authority of compelling the expenditure of any large sum of money, but he at the same time should wish that the central commissioners should be invested with power to call the attention of parishes and unions to the state of their workhouse establishments, and to suggest to them the propriety of adding to those formed, or building, separate and distinct establishments. (Hear, hear.) He should also propose that in certain cases a difference should be made in the constitution of parochial vestries. At present these bodies were composed of rate payers and no one else, and in many instances the means

of a large expenditure was inflicted on those who had no vote in the vestry. He should therefore propose, that with respect to raising permanent sums of money, such as for the purpose of facilitating emigration, and improving and building workhouses, the landlord, as well as the occupier of land should have a vote in the vestry. It was only equitable that such should be the case; because where the occupier had not been long in possession of a farm, and had very little interest in the expenditure, it was most desirable that the permanent interest in the land should have a vote in these cases. (Hear.) He had already stated that from the conclusion of the last century up to the present time, the magistracy of this country, though acting with every good feeling of humanity, had in the administration of the poor laws fallen into considerable mistakes, and he had himself, in his own situation as magistrate, not unfrequently felt bound to act upon bad and erroneous principles in this respect. (Hear.) With this view he should propose that justices should not in future have the power of ordering parochial relief to persons in their own houses—he meant out-door relief to the poor. (Hear, hear.) This would not be an alteration of the present law, but would be a restoration of the law to the state in which it was previous to the year 1796, a period since which the abuses in the management of the poor laws had very considerably increased. He had now submitted the main and principal part of the proposition which he should have to submit for the adoption of the house.

The house would now see that the effect of this measure was to stop the allowance system—to deprive the magistracy of the power of ordering out-door relief—to alter in certain cases the constitution of parochial vestries—to give large discretionary powers to the central commissioners—and to carry into operation further regulations which might be found essential, in order to improve and bring into a good state and condition the present system of laws regulating the relief of the pauper portion of the community. There remained, however, two other subjects to which he should also wish to call the attention of the house. The first point was with reference to the existing law of settlement. (Hear.) He need not say to those who were acquainted with the subject, that the present law was most complicated in its character, involving great litigation, and consequently considerable expense, to every parish in the country. In addition to these evils a still worse effect arose from the present law: he alluded to its interference with the free circulation of labour. (Hear, hear.) The worst portion of the law was that which gave a settlement by hiring and servitude; but he was inclined to say that every mode of acquiring a settlement ought to be abolished, except only those acquired by birth or marriage. To the proposition he only anticipated two objections. The first was the hardship which would be inflicted upon an individual who had quitted the place of his birth in early life, and in another parish supported himself for a long series of years by his own industry, by his removal when fallen into want and decay, and thereby become chargeable on the parish, to the place of his nativity. He (Lord Althorp) was aware that such might be the case; but he did not think, that when a man had supported himself in a distant parish from that in which he was born, by his industry and labour to an old age, it would be likely that he would be so destitute of friends that his removal would be permitted. The other objection was not entitled to so much weight as that to which he had alluded. It was generally considered that the best labourers were those who did not belong to the parish in which they exercised their industry, and that the effect of making birth the test of settlement in all cases would be that such labourers would not seek employment out of their own districts. With regard to the mode of fixing birth as the test of settlement, he should say that the children should follow the settlement of their parents until they attained the age of 16 years, and that after that period their settlement should be fixed at the place of their birth. Now, from his own experience he could say that he had seen as good labourers in the parish of which they were natives as those who did not belong to it; but even if the latter were the best servants, as was supposed, he did not think that any man would speculate on a settlement of 16 years hence, and on that speculation abstain from giving employment to those whom it would be most to his advantage to have in his service. He therefore conceived the fears which might be entertained from a change in this respect were merely imaginary, and in

his opinion the advantages to be gained, by the removal altogether of local settlements otherwise to be acquired, were so great as completely to counterbalance the objections which he had anticipated. One of the advantages to be gained would be the complete simplification of the system; the apprehensions at present entertained by the farmer of hiring a man for longer than 51 weeks lest he should gain a settlement would be abolished; the removal of his clothes from the house of his employer within that period for a day would become unnecessary (hear), and therefore it would follow that the farmer would not hesitate to take the best calculated to suit his purposes, and consequently the labourer who best deserved it would obtain employment. These advantages were of themselves important; but to them must also be added the immense diminution in the expenses of litigation on questions of settlement, because by simplifying the law the difficulty of proof which at present prevailed would be almost entirely removed, while at the same time also it would give a freedom to labour which would be beneficial to the whole population of the country. (Hear, hear.)

He had also already spoken of another alteration in the present law, with respect to orders of removal, and of appeal therefrom. He would propose that it should be provided in the measure he hoped to introduce, that no order of removal should take effect until a copy of that order, and of the examination upon which it had been pronounced, should have been served upon the authorities of the parish to which the removal was contemplated (hear); and he should further propose that every notice of appeal should set forth the precise grounds upon which it was to be sustained, and also that it should be provided that on the trial of such appeal before the quarter sessions nothing should be pleaded or discussed, and no points raised, beyond those stated in the notice given in the manner he had suggested. He need not say that the first of these measures would have a very considerable tendency to prevent litigation, inasmuch as the parish which was sought to be burdened with the maintenance and support of a pauper would be enabled to ascertain whether or not it was properly chargeable; whereas under the present state of things, it was well known that removals of paupers were made under mistake, and those mistakes were not discovered until the appeal was brought before the quarter sessions. (Hear.) The second regulation which he proposed also was calculated to prevent litigation, because by such explicit statement the parties sought to be affected would be enabled to judge whether they had any prospect of success by opposing, and if not the order would necessarily be abandoned. Such would be the case as to the amount of litigation between individual parishes; but he must remark, that by the change he proposed the advantage would be still greater by the union of parishes, which would diminish considerably the number of pauper removals. (Hear, hear.)

There still remained another point bearing upon the subject of the existing poor laws, and on which, though he had long felt considerable difficulty, he felt himself forced to come forward on the present occasion to state the opinions entertained by himself and the Government: he alluded to the law as it now stood relating to illegitimate children. (Hear.) On this topic he did not hesitate to say that the present state of the law in this respect was a direct encouragement to vice and immorality, and that the effect of imprisoning the reputed fathers of illegitimate offspring, frequently the finest young men in the country, was to demoralize and corrupt them, and the consequent mischief and injury inflicted upon the whole community was incalculable. (Hear, hear.) He begged hon. members to consider the state of the law as it at present stood. If a woman chose to swear that she was pregnant of an illegitimate child, the party whom she charged upon oath as the father was *ipso facto* liable to be committed to prison until he could find security for the maintenance and support of the child. Now, hon. members must know the difficulty to which a labourer in husbandry so situated would be exposed, and that difficulty in finding securities not being surmounted, the effect of the law was the committal at once of the individual to prison for five or six months, there to be associated with the very worst of characters. (Hear.) He would therefore take away such a power of imprisonment, and at the same time make the mother liable for the support of her child, in the manner and mode of a pauper widow. He felt most completely the difficulty and delicacy of the

subject, but he was equally confident it was proveable to demonstration that the proposed change, so far from increasing demoralization, would be beneficial in every degree to the country at large. (Hear.)

He believed he had now gone through all the various important topics which would be embraced by the bill which he hoped to have the honour to introduce. He was fully aware of the importance of the measure—no man more strongly than himself, and he believed—nay, he was confident, if it was successful, the benefits to the country would be to the greatest possible amount. He was also cognizant of the fact, that by the proposition he had now submitted, the Government exposed themselves to the opposition of those who pretended to be the friends of the labouring poor; he, however, would fearlessly assert that the measure he had now proposed was designed and intended principally for the benefit of that portion of the population of the country. (Hear, hear.) The labouring classes would, he was satisfied, be the gainers by the measure if successful, and he confidently anticipated that it would have the effect to restore the British labourer to that degree of independence for which he was once proverbial, and to raise him from the condition of a pauperized slave. (Hear, hear.) So far from the labourer being apprehensive as to the effect of the abolition of the allowance system, he believed he would hail it as a great boon. The labourer should be remunerated for his industry according to his merits, and not on a scale regulated by the number of his children, and by this change the advantage would be given to the most industrious and meritorious. At present no difference existed between the good and the bad, both were in the same situation as to remuneration, if such could be called the subsistence derived from the abuse of these laws. (Hear.) It had been said that poverty ought not to be visited as a crime. In that sentiment he most entirely agreed; but it was impossible to prevent it as a misfortune. In every attempt which had been as yet made to remove that misfortune, instead of confining it to those who suffered under the chilling hand of poverty, the misfortune had been extended to almost every other class. (Hear.) It was with these views, and in the hope that the house would give it that calm and deliberate attention which the momentous importance of the measure demanded, he should conclude by moving for leave to bring in a bill to alter and amend the laws relating to the poor. • The noble lord resumed his seat amidst loud and general cheering.

---

## ADMISSION OF THE DISSENTERS TO DEGREES IN THE TWO GREAT UNIVERSITIES.

---

ON Thursday, the 17th inst., Colonel Williams made a motion for an address to the Crown, praying His Majesty to signify his pleasure to the two great Universities, that they should no longer insist on the tests and declarations imposed by the edicts of James the First, calling on all who entered them as students, to declare their adherence to the doctrines and tenets of the Church of England; or, in other words, opening these Universities equally to the Dissenter and the Churchman.

Mr. Buckingham seconded the motion; on which an amendment was moved, exactly similar in spirit, though different in form, by Mr. G. W. Wood, “for leave to bring in a bill to grant to His Majesty’s subjects generally the right of admission to the English Universities, and of equal eligibility to the degrees therein, notwithstanding their diversities of religious opinions, degrees in Divinity alone excepted.”

After the lengthened discussion that had taken place on the Cambridge petition, this subject had lost much of its interest as a matter of debate, and the speeches on both sides were therefore dull and heavy. But when the division came, it was seen that this diminution of interest was confined merely to the speaking, and not to the voting. The numbers being—For the Bill, 185; Against it, 44.

Towards the close of the debate, great impatience was manifested by the House, and those who rose late to address it, especially Mr. Hill, Mr. Baines, and Mr. Ord, were assailed with cries of "Question," and "Divide," which were continued for a long period. The best speech of the evening was, undoubtedly, Dr. Lushington's; and nothing could exceed the dulness of those of Mr. Estcourt, Sir Robert Inglis, and Mr. Goulburn, the three representatives of the Universities, the fourth being Sir Charles Manners Sutton, the Speaker, who occupied the chair.

Whether the House of Lords will make any opposition to this Bill after it shall have passed through the Commons, remains to be seen. We should not at all wonder at the Bishops and Peers making a great exertion to throw it out. But this will be of no avail. The decree for establishing Religious Liberty has gone forth, and no power can stay its speedy execution. The Universities, and the Church to which they belong, may preserve their unjust privileges for a short time longer. But before the present rising generation shall have attained to old age, though the fabrics of both may remain, their exclusive privileges will be wholly taken away or surrendered; and all sects of Christians, at least, will be placed on a footing of perfect equality, with nothing short of which ought any conscientious Christian to be satisfied.

---

## PROPOSED PLAN OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERPETUATION OF CHURCH RATES.\*

---

LORD ALTHORP having fixed on Monday evening, the 21st, as the day on which he should bring on his resolutions for the *abolition* of Church Rates, the House was very crowded at an early hour; and the call of the House, which was fixed for the following day, having brought a great many members to town for the first time during the present session, the number of strange faces was very considerable.

Soon after five o'clock, Lord Althorp rose to unfold his plan; and as far as could be gathered from his own air and manner, as well as from the looks of those who sat on the Treasury bench, the Ministers appeared to think that their proposition was such as to ensure its favourable reception by all parties. Never were they, however, more lamentably disappointed. As the noble lord proceeded with his statement, it was soon seen that all idea of *abolishing* Church Rates had been abandoned, and that the extent of the proposed plan was, that the churches should be kept in repair by a grant of 250,000*l.* a year from the public funds, instead of by rates raised in vestry in the usual manner; a change which, while it still violated the principle of religious

liberty, by making the Dissenter pay equally with the Churchman for the support of an Establishment from which he dissented, had this feature in common with that of the plan for the Commutation of Tithes, that it made more fixed, permanent, and perpetual, the funds for the support of the Church, than they were before; and recognised with all the sanction of the Legislature the very principle to which the Dissenters so strongly object; namely, that all parties or sects in the State should contribute to the maintenance of the State Religion, however much they might hold that religion to be erroneous in doctrine, faith, or form.

The payment of Church Rates by Dissenters had, as Lord Althorp himself truly remarked, been objected to by them, not so much on account of their amount (for the whole sum raised did not exceed 500,000*l.* a year), as on account of its violation of the principle they held sacred; namely, that every sect should maintain its own establishment, and no one be made to contribute towards supporting the temples or the priesthood of another. Lord Althorp admitted this; and admitted that he wished to give the Dissenters satisfaction, by relieving their consciences and their purses at the same time. And how does he propose to do this? Why, by taking away the *name* of Church Rates, and putting a stop to the control of vestries over sums to be voted as such; and then, dividing the kinds of repairs required for Churches into two classes—the substantial repair of the edifice, and its surplus adornments—he says—The *first* shall be paid for by an annual appropriation of the sum of 250,000*l.* taken from the land tax, to which Dissenters contribute as well as Churchmen, and which deficiency *must* be supplied by taxes to the same amount drawn from some other source; and the *second* shall be paid by those who are frequenters of the Church alone.—Now, as a relief to the *consciences* of the Dissenters, this is really none at all; since to them, the being forced to keep the churches in substantial repair is just as much an imposition on them as being obliged to pay for the ornamental decorations. They should contribute to support both, or be relieved from paying for either; and the last is the only position compatible with the rights of conscience and true religious liberty. As to the *pecuniary* relief there will be little or none; for the same, if not a greater sum will be expended on Church building and Church decoration; only it will be extracted from the pockets of the people in an indirect rather than a direct manner, so that they will not be so sensible of its amount; but it will not on that account be the less a real burden, though it will not be so heavy an apparent one.

Lord Althorp was followed by Mr. Hume, who objected to the plan entirely, and thought that if the Church must be supported by the State for some time to come, until the nation was ripe for their separation, the best way would be to declare the whole of the Church property to be national, and then to pay the Ecclesiastical establishment as we at present pay the navy and army, by voting annually, in the estimates laid before Parliament, the sum necessary for its support, subject to all the control which the representatives of the people would exercise over it.

Mr. GISEBORNE expressed his dissatisfaction at the plan which had been announced by the noble lord. The noble lord had advanced no argument in support of the connexion between the church and state which would not be equally



applicable to the continuance of the connexion between the state and the practice of medicine, if that union had happened to have been formed some centuries ago. Under these circumstances, the noble lord could have done no less than say, "We will interfere between no man and his doctor; each person may pursue his own road to health or to suffering, and all that we ask is, that he should pay the state physician." (Hear.) The question was simply one of payment, whether that payment were just or unjust. When the government surrendered the church-rates in Ireland, they broke the magic circle of the inviolability of church property, and the English Dissenters never would be content until the same measure of justice was dealt out to them—namely, the unconditional surrender of church property. He could not help designating the noble lord's plan as an experiment on the gullibility of the Dissenters. (Hear.) It was founded upon the old financial principle, that if money were taken out of the pockets of the people by indirect instead of direct means, they would not be aware of their loss. What did the Dissenters complain of? Of contributing to the support of a church whose doctrines they did not approve of. How did the noble lord propose to relieve them? By making them pay as much for that purpose as they did at the present moment. (Hear, hear.) With great respect for the noble lord, he must say that this measure was a second edition of the marriage bill recently brought forward by the Government, and he believed in his heart that it would excite as much dissatisfaction.

The noble lord seemed to think that it ought to be satisfactory to the Dissenters, but he (Mr. Gisborne) thought that it would and ought to be unsatisfactory to all Dissenters and liberal men. He argued, with the hon. member for Middlesex, that the best course which the noble lord could have pursued would have been to have brought in a bill to declare simply that church-rates should cease, and that henceforth churches should be supported by those only who used them. He totally differed from those who thought that this would be offering a premium for dissent. There was another course which the noble lord might have pursued—he might have made provision for the building and repair of churches out of the revenues of the church itself. It was generally admitted that there were sinecure offices in the church which might be abolished or reduced without in any degree impairing the efficiency of the establishment, though such a course might possibly affect the hospitality days of the deans and chapters. It appeared to him to be demonstrable that the revenues of the church were more than sufficient. There were always a number of candidates for a vacant benefice. He believed that to men of average ability the church offered greater advantages as a pecuniary speculation than any other profession. If he had a remarkably stupid son—which, thank God, he had not—he knew no better mode of getting him a comfortable living than by educating him for the church. (A laugh.) It had been proposed to make every living in the church worth 300*l.* a-year, but even that would not, in his opinion, remove from the church the scandal of having a large number of poor clergymen unprovided for. The noble lord had it in his power to have brought forward a measure which would have satisfied all orders of people, instead of which he had propounded a plan with respect to which he hoped he was prophesying correctly when he said that it would be rejected by the house and the country. (Hear.)

Sir Robert Inglis expressed his great satisfaction at finding Lord Althorp recognized in this plan, the duty of the State to maintain the Church; and in consideration of this *leading* feature of it, he would submit to some defects in its details.

Mr. Divett and Mr. Wilks both expressed their extreme disappointment and dissatisfaction at the plan. Mr. Stanley defended, and Mr. D. W. Harvey exposed it in an able and uncompromising speech. He was followed by Lord John Russell, who expressed his devoted attachment to the Church, and defended the plan of Lord Althorp, as consistent with the highest respect for the rights of the Dissenters. As his was the best speech on the Government side, we give it entire, as

reported, to balance against Mr. Gisborne's: and it will be seen that the difference is great between them.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL felt it incumbent on him to state the grounds of his opposition in sentiment to the hon. and learned member who had just sat down. That hon. and learned member professed a readiness to support generally the measures of his Majesty's Government, but lamented that he could not do so on the present occasion. He (Lord J. Russell) should be totally wanting in candour and openness if he did not state that the reason why that hon. and learned member and his friends were so frequently disappointed as to the nature of the measures which were introduced from time to time, arose in a great difference of opinion, which he (Lord J. Russell) was afraid would never be reconciled (hear, hear), for while the one wished to preserve and reform, they could never be brought into an accordance with the views of those who were anxious in the first place to destroy. (Cheers.) The hon. member for Middlesex did not disguise his feelings; he stated openly that he looked to the destruction of the established church; neither had the hon. and learned member concealed his sentiments. They acted according to their persuasion; he (Lord J. Russell), on the other hand, acted according to his conscientious and firm conviction that an established church tended to the advancement of religion, the promotion of morality, and the maintenance of good order, government, and civilization in a state. (Cheers.) He believed, moreover, that the church of England was that established church which was consonant to the opinions and feelings of the great body of the population of the country. (Cheers.) He therefore looked upon the present measure with regard to church rates, not as preparing the way for the destruction of the establishment, as the hon. and learned member would have it, but with the view, by removing reasonable and fairly stated grievances, to maintain in its influence that church which when duly and adequately reformed, as he trusted would soon be the case, was most importantly conducive to the welfare and permanent benefit of the state. (Cheers.)

The hon. and learned gentleman stated that in his opinion if there was a church establishment there must be certain doctrines laid down to which the members of the state should be made to conform—i. e. in other words, there could not be a church establishment without intolerance. (Hear.) Such was certainly the case with the church of Rome; but his opinion, he (Lord J. Russell) must say, was directly the reverse. He maintained there might be a church establishment supported by the state and by compulsory payment consistently with the maintenance of perfect religious freedom, and without in the slightest degree violating the sanctuary of conscience (hear, hear), every one being permitted to prefer and adhere to that religious faith of which in his own conscience he approved. (Hear, hear.) With those opinions he had always gone along with the Protestant Dissenters of the country, in seeking the removal of religious disabilities, but always with the firm conviction of the necessity and advantage of an established church; and much as he should regret not coinciding with their opinions, supporting their views, and removing their grievances, yet, if the hon. and learned member for Colchester, and the hon. member for Boston, were to be taken on the present occasion as the real expositors of their sentiments, and if he were to understand they would not be satisfied with any thing by which the principle of a church establishment was recognized, he must, however reluctantly, at once declare his opposition to all such extrayagant claims. (Hear.)

With respect to the proposition immediately before the house, the voting of a certain sum out of the land-tax of England and Wales. to be applied to the support of churches, he must be allowed to say, there was a difference to be observed between the churches of the establishment and those of the Dissenters. In the latter case the chapels were built where there was a congregation in want of them; so that there was always a subscription to maintain them; but in the case of the parish churches, which every one in the country, he was sure, would be grieved to see falling into decay, those especially which were planted in the rural districts, if not supported by some fund like the present, they, from the nature of the congregations, would be found in a very few years in the most melancholy state of dilapidation and ruin. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Middlesex

had stated his belief that the plan now proposed had been suggested by the bench of bishops, and yet in another part of his speech that hon. member declared his conviction that it would not give satisfaction to the church—two propositions which certainly seemed somewhat contradictory and destructive of each other. (Hear.) He assured that hon. member, however, that it was founded on no communication whatever with that right rev. body; it had been brought forward simply with the view explained by his noble friend, of doing away with a perpetual and increasing source of irritation and dispute with regard to the payment of the church-rates, and at the same time preserving, as was felt to be desirable, the principle of an establishment. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Cutlar Ferguson, Mr. Wallace, and Mr. Gillon, as Scotch members, objected to the plan, as making both Scotch and Irish Dissenters, who had never before paid Church rates in any shape, pay the same through the land tax. Mr. Robinson and Mr. Baines also opposed it on behalf of the English Dissenters. The latter gentleman was as uncourteously received and treated during all the time he was speaking, as himself and Mr. Hill were on the former debate on the Dissenters' grievances in the preceding week. The clamourers in the House seem to make an aim at some particular individuals, and to keep up a system of personal annoyance towards them, in the most unworthy manner. A little exercise of patience, however, accompanied with firmness and perseverance, is sure to overcome these assaults.

Mr. Wynn, and Sir M. W. Ridley, approved of the Government plan; and Lord Althorp and Mr. Stanley each spoke a second time in reply, when a division being called for, the numbers were—For the substitution of an annual grant of 250,000*l.* a-year from the land-tax, to supply the place of the Church rates, according to the plan of Lord Althorp, 256;—Against it, 140. The list of the Minority will be found in its proper place.

## MR. O'CONNELL'S MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE ON THE IRISH UNION.

TUESDAY, the 22d, being the day appointed for the discussion of the great Question, whether the Legislative Union between England and Ireland, and the abolition of the native Parliament of the latter, had been productive of benefit or injury to Ireland itself, or to the Empire at large, considerable expectation and excitement prevailed. Mr. Rice, who had undertaken to meet Mr. O'Connell on this question, had moved that the House should be called over on this day, in order to secure the fullest possible attendance of members; and as it was known that the call would be enforced, it had brought a large number of members to town, for the first time during the present session, to avoid the penalty of being placed in the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, a release from whose grasp can only be obtained by the payment of very heavy fees.

The chair was taken at four o'clock, an hour earlier than the usual time of meeting, to call over the names of the members for a ballot on the Dungarvon election, which occupied the first half-hour. On the

termination of this, some petitions were presented by English and Irish members, praying for a repeal of the Union between England and Ireland, which occupied the remainder of the hour till five o'clock, when the Order of the Day was read, for calling over the House, which was done in the following manner: the gallery being empty during the whole of the sitting, and no stranger or reporter permitted to be present. Mr. Ley, the chief clerk, read, from the official books, the names of all the English members first, following the alphabetical order of counties, beginning with Bedfordshire, and ending with Yorkshire; and calling the names of all the members of places in each county in succession; then Scotland, and then Ireland in the same manner. About 500 answered to their names; and the remaining 158 were called over a second time after the first list had been gone through, and about fifty of these answered to their names, having come in since the early sitting. The remaining 100 were moved to be called over again on the following day, when such as were not excused by previous leave of absence, or by illness, would be liable to be sent after by the Sergeant-at-Arms, if the House should so determine, and brought up, however distant they might be, to attend in their place, and besides the fees for their release, be saddled with all the expense of the journey both ways, undertaken for their seizure or capture.

This proceeding lasted from five till half-past, six o'clock, and was both tiresome and useless; since, the avowed object of enforcing a call of the House is to secure the actual attendance of each member during the debate, and to ensure his voting upon the question when put to a division; while, in *reality*, no security whatever is taken for his doing either of these two last and most important duties. If he attends in his place when his name is called over, and passes his muster, he may leave the House immediately afterwards—absent himself during the whole of the debate—and give no vote at all upon the division, and he would not incur any censure or penalty for so doing. A call of the House, to be of any real use, should enforce, not merely the coming to the first assembling, but a continuous attendance, and, above all, a final expression of opinion by a vote on the question when put for decision. But so full of fiction and delusion are almost all our forms of law and legislation—that the very things which are of no use to be attained are secured by the strongest guarantees, and the things that are all important to be accomplished, are utterly overlooked and neglected. And yet, there is no doubt that should any member propose an alteration on this matter, he would be met with the charge of innovation on our ancient and venerable constitution, and told that it was presumption to attempt to disturb or amend forms so admirably adapted to the due solemnity of public business, by the sagacity and wisdom of our ancestors!

At about a quarter before seven o'clock, the call of the House having been gone through, and the petitions relating to the Repeal of the Union between England and Ireland laid upon the table, Mr. O'Connell was called upon by the Speaker—and rose to enter on the debate. The House was exceedingly full, even to the side galleries; the attention was very deep, and every thing betokened a very animated and interesting debate. Mr. O'Connell began, however, apparently out of spirits, in a lower tone of voice than usual, and seemed oppressed with the weight of his subject or the consciousness of an entire want of sym-

pathy in his auditory, and he never came up to his accustomed standard of spirit, or force, or eloquence throughout. The speech occupied five hours in the delivery, and was spread over so wide a range, that both its length and the multiplicity of its details, were prejudicial to the speaker and his cause; for instead of enlisting, as it must have been the interest of both to do, the sympathies of those who were hostile or neutral to the motion, it had a wearying and fatiguing effect: which was evinced by the gradual dropping off, and retiring of very many of the Members, long before the close.

To give any abridgment of such a speech, which should convey even its principal topics to our readers, would not be practicable in the space we could devote to it in our present Number; but we may say of its character, that it was more heavy, in matter and manner, than Mr. O'Connell's speeches usually are,—that it was too much encumbered with historical documents and financial details,—that it was very much too long to be heard with pleasure, and what is not heard with pleasure is unavailing for conviction, and therefore thrown away—and that if he had occupied just half the time in discussing the only part of the question to which an English House of Commons will give a ready ear, namely, what *effect* has been produced by the Union between England and Ireland, on both these countries, as seen in those broad and tangible consequences which all can appreciate, and none can misunderstand,—he would have made a far more powerful impression, and advanced his object much beyond the point at which this long, and tedious, and inefficient speech has placed it. That Mr. O'Connell *could* have done this, if he had chosen, no one who is in the habit of witnessing his really great powers, and varied talent, can for a moment doubt. We think it was an error in judgment in him not to have done so; but he may, perhaps, reserve himself for the reply, when all the facts and arguments on the other side shall have been stated: though an opening speech of five hours will somewhat lessen the disposition of the House to hear a reply extended over any similar length of time.

As to the idea that some persons seem to entertain, that it is dangerous to discuss the question of the Union with Ireland at all; and that granting a Committee of Enquiry as to its effects, would be conceding to the Repealers, and prejudging the whole matter in dispute; we confess we have no such impressions, and no such fears. The dissolution of the Union between England and Ireland is a question as fairly open to discussion as that of a dissolution of the union between Church and State. They are both questions of political expediency. If the Union between the two countries has been productive of more good than evil, it is surely in the power of those who hold such an opinion to prove it by evidence: and therefore they should advocate the inquiry for which Mr. O'Connell asks; since the proof of the benefit will show the good policy of our prolonging that measure, and set the question for a long period at least at rest. For ourselves, we have not come to any very decided opinion on the question, being rather inclined however, at present, to believe that both the parties in the dispute are in error, that the Union has neither been productive of the great good to Ireland which some contend, nor the great injury which others declare; that the evils under which Ireland at present labours have sprung from

other causes than the Union,—and that their cure is to be found in other remedies than its Repeal. But though we thus think, and though we should give our vote against such Repeal, if that were the point at issue,—we can yet see no danger whatever in granting the Committee of Inquiry which is asked for in the following terms of Mr. O'Connell's motion :

“That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report on the means by which the dissolution of the Parliament of Ireland was effected ; on the effects of that measure upon Ireland, and upon the labourers in husbandry and operatives in manufactures in England ; and on the probable consequences of continuing the Legislative Union between both countries.”

At twelve o'clock, when Mr. O'Connell's speech was concluded, Mr. Rice rose, and professed his readiness to answer Mr. O'Connell, if the House were disposed to give him their attention ; but it being certain that the reply would require several hours also ; and that the debate would even then have to be adjourned, as nearly all the Irish members would be expected to speak upon the question, which would prolong the discussion probably through the entire week, the feeling of the House was strongly in favour of an adjournment, which was accordingly moved by Mr. Rice, who thus secured to himself the privilege of opening the debate on the following evening. We shall wait, therefore, until its termination, and then endeavour to present, if not a report, at least a summary or review of the week's debate, with the result of our own impression after hearing the whole.

---

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR.

---

### IMPORTANT ANALYSIS OF THE CONNEXION OF CRIME WITH INTEMPERANCE.

SIR,

Edinburgh, April, 1834.

I beg to inclose a document that may be useful to you, as showing the opinion of the justices of the peace in regard to the effects that the use of *spirits* is working in this part of the country.

I have been this day in the City Chambers, and have ascertained from the official records, that in the Royalty (or city), there were issued for the year 1833-4, 736 certificates for licences. The Royalty contains 55,232 souls, and 11,046 families. There is therefore a licence to every fifteenth family. The whole population of Edinburgh and its suburbs is about 166,000, but beyond the Royalty the licenses are mixed up with those of the county, and it is not so easy to obtain a distinct account of them. About three years ago it was said that there were 1700 licences in the whole place.

The following is an extract from a valuable Report of the House of Correction at Preston, Lancashire, drawn up by the Rev. Mr. Clay, the chaplain, for last year.

“With regard to the important question, as to the origin of crime, the chaplain begs to state that, about the end of September, he held a particular conversation with every individual in the jail, as to the circumstances, which in their own opinion, had brought them into their melancholy condition, and taking their voluntary communications as a general criterion, he learned that 48 persons of

various ages, and both sexes, committed on charges of felony for trial at the present sessions, the alleged offences of

"24 are directly attributable to the ale-house or beer-shops; 13 prisoners deny their guilt, and decline making any communication; 7 offences seem to have been committed under circumstances of temptation; 4 prisoners plead want as an excuse for their offences.

"Among 27 convicted male felons, 2 attribute their offences to want, 3 to temptation, and 22 to drinking.

"Of 36 cases of assault, 3 are attributable to idleness and bad company, 5 to combinations among the spinners, 7 to combination and drinking, and 21 to drinking alone.

"Of 14 cases of vagrancy, 6 are referable to idleness and depravity, 6 to the plea of distress, and 2 to drunkenness.

"Of 21 bastardy cases, 15 men attribute their condition to idleness and ignorance, and 6 to drinking.

"Three utterers of base coin attribute their fate to drinking,

"Two men confined for neglect of work assign drinking as the cause.

"Of 8 men confined for neglecting their families, 2 plead innocence of the charge, 4 distress, and 2 drunkenness.

"Of 7 poachers, 2 refer their practices to bad company, and 5 to drinking.

"Of 6 men imprisoned for obtaining money under false pretences, 2 plead want, 4 impute their offences to a passion for drinking.

"Six soldiers are imprisoned for military offences arising from drinking.

"Of 10 men confined for various misdemeanours, 1 attributes his offence to temptation, 4 assert their innocence, and 5 impute their situation to drinking.

"There are 14 females convicted of felony, of whom, 1 asserts her innocence, 1 (girl) pleads neglect of parents, 1 pleads exposure to great temptation, 1 is of weak intellects, 3 appear very ignorant and depraved, and 7 attribute their situation to drinking.

"Thus it appears that the passion for liquor is a source of ruin and disgrace, more fruitful than every other cause combined, and that of 189 offenders of all descriptions, there were 116 who imputed their misfortunes or their crimes to the temptations held out to them by the ale-houses and the beer-shops. It remains to be seen whether the recent legislative enactment for the regulation of the latter, will, in any degree, check the mischiefs which they have occasioned or increased. In the mean time, the chaplain cannot refrain from stating the opinion which, over and over again, has been, in substance, avowed to him by the ruined victims of intoxication, that but for the desolating passion, which finds the unchecked means of indulgence at every moment and in every place, our numerous prisons would be almost untenanted."

I have transcribed the above upon the *chance* of the Report not having met your eye.

If we had had longer notice I have little doubt but that petitions might have been got up from every Temperance Society in the kingdom, praying for the eventual annihilation of distillation of spirits as a *drink*. If we could succeed in taking off the malt and hop duties, so as to place good beer within the reach of the poor, suppress public-houses and beer-shops as much as possible, so as to induce the people to drink their ale at their own fireside, as formerly, and annihilate spirits, some hope might be entertained for the next generation. For years past, Government has been making criminals by the quickest mode, and then punishing them by the most sanguinary code in the Christian world!

I remain, dear Sir, yours truly,

R. K. GREVILLE. "

At a Meeting of a General Quarter-Sessions of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the County of Edinburgh, held within the County Court Room, Edinburgh, on Tuesday the 21st May, 1833;

The following Resolutions of the Committee appointed for the granting of Certificates for Ale-Licences, was read and approved of, and the Clerk was directed to get them printed and circulated among the Justices and Parochial Ministers of the County:—

1st, That considering the great number of Tippling Houses and Shops for the Sale of Spirituous Liquors, in which such Liquors are sold to be drunk on the Premises, it is necessary that the number of Houses and Shops to which Certificates are granted, for the purpose of obtaining Excise Licences for the sale of Spirits, should be as much as possible reduced.

2d, That therefore, at their different Meetings for granting Certificates, the Justices should consider the number of Licences previously granted in the Town of Edinburgh, and should not increase, but rather diminish the number of Licences as much as practicable.

3d, That the Certificate should be held as granted for the House or Premises, and not for the Tenant or Occupier.

4th, That no Certificate should be granted for a New Inn or Public House, unless after the fullest inquiry into the special circumstances of the case.

5th, That no Certificate should be granted to a Shop not previously licensed, unless where the Justices are satisfied that the Shop is set up for the general purposes of Trade, and not for a Tippling House.

Such are the Resolutions and Plan by which the Committee recommend the granting of Excise Licences for the sale of Spirits under the existing Law. But the Committee cannot avoid this occasion of stating it to the County as their most decided opinion, that the present low rate of Duty upon Spirits is rapidly promoting the deterioration of the morals and habits of many classes of the Community, and therefore the Committee are decidedly of opinion that the County of Edinburgh ought immediately to make a strong representation to Government, earnestly recommending the imposition of a very considerable increase of the Duty upon Spirits.

JOHN HOPE, *J. P., Preses.*"

#### MR. CAYLEY'S REGISTRY BILL—SIMPLIFICATION OF TRANSFER OF PROPERTY.

SIR,

*Cambridge, April, 1834.*

The country expects your assistance in its attempt to extricate itself from the grasp of the lawyers, well knowing that the Press, so independent on most subjects, is under the influence of the attorneys, who have it in their power to give advertisements to such newspapers as will not attack the infamous state of the law. *None dare to defend it!* If the lawyers are not able to defeat Mr. Cayley's Registry Bill, the nation will derive more advantage from that measure than is contemplated generally. An efficient registry will render it as easy to transfer an estate from its owner to a purchaser or mortgagee, by a simple endorsement on the back of the original deed, as a bill of exchange is now passed from one party to another. A multiplicity of deeds only creates confusion (particularly if one should happen to be lost), and entails great expense. If Government will have a tax on the transfer of real property, which is only reasonable in lieu of stamps, let it be collected at the registry offices. The excuse now made by solicitors for giving every purchaser a fresh deed is, that a stamp is required, and something must be written upon it. I am sure you will immediately see the absurdity of having any additional deeds beyond the original deed describing the property.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A FRIEND TO JUSTICE. \*



## ORIGIN OF BRITISH TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES.

THE increasing interest evinced by the public, in the establishment of Temperance Societies, induces us to give their origin, in these countries, so far as we have been able to obtain information.

Before the establishment of Temperance Societies in America had crossed the Atlantic, or at least before those more striking statements had reached our shores, a medical gentleman in Dublin (Dr. Harvey), who had much opportunity for observation amongst the poor, as one of the physicians to a dispensary in the desolated part of that city, termed *the Liberty*, felt deeply concerned on observing the unspeakable havoc made by that many-headed monster, INTemperance; and occasionally called public attention to the subject, through the newspapers, by anonymous paragraphs, or by letters under various signatures. A letter, under the signature of PRO PATRIA, containing a very striking American document, styled *National Cost of Intemperance*, was inserted in the *Dublin Morning Post*, on the 20th May, 1829, as being particularly well calculated to arouse those who might not be so ready to consider the subject on strictly religious, or on moral grounds. Other letters followed. And amongst the individuals, whom the medical gentleman endeavoured to interest on the occasion, was Doctor Cheyne, Physician-General to the army in Ireland, whose countenance, exertions, and influence, were promptly and efficiently given. On the 14th of September, 1829, an association was formed. But, it appears, that much about the same period, and possibly previously, other well-disposed men, in distant parts of the kingdom, were exerting themselves to the same effect,—as a Temperance Society was established in the town of New Ross, county of Wexford, on the 21st of August, 1829, by two benevolent and useful men, George William Carr, and Samuel Eilly; the first Temperance Society, probably (we mean on the principle of total abstinence from ardent spirits), which has been established in the Old World; and, certainly, as far as we are aware, the first which was established in these kingdoms. A spark of the sacred fire from America had early found its way to the north of Ireland, which soon kindled a wide-spread and lofty flame. It was, also, in the month of August, that Professor Edgar, of Belfast, commenced his powerful appeals, through the public press, and otherwise; soon after which he visited Scotland and England, and, with some excellent men in each kingdom,\* greatly excited the public attention; all which *eventuated* (as our American brethren have it), in those great national and district societies in Britain, now too well known to require further observation.

## INTEREST OF TRADESMEN, AS OVERSEERS, IN INCREASING THE POOR RATES.

*East Bourne, Sussex.*

A circumstance occurred ~~here~~ on the 26th of March, which if you kindly take the trouble of investigating, it is hoped may increase rents, and add to the security of landed property throughout England.

An experienced Magistrate last winter invited the principal Rate payers, who are Farmers, to dinner, that he might consult them on the best mode of reducing the parochial burdens; and the result was, that at Lady tide, no Tradesmen were appointed overseers for the ensuing year, that they might not supply the Workhouse profusely from their shops—Whereas on reference to the 21st page of the First Poor Law Report, it appeared that the total of inmates, in the House, for the year ending March, 1832, was 87, and the average number relieved, was about 60, whose food did not cost more than 3s. per head weekly; consequently, the whole did not exceed 468*l.*; whilst the manufacture in the workhouse of Linen, Woollen, Shoes, and Straw Hats, after paying for the materials, yielded 220*l.*; and allowing 2*l.* each for the clothing of the inmates, made 120*l.*—322*l.*; which reduced the cost of the Paupers in the Workhouse, to only 146*l.* Whereas the names are given of 174 men not infirm; women, 120; and children under 12 years of age, 238—532; who received 1978*l.* 12s. 6*d.* in cash, for standing still,

\* The names of Dunlop and of Collins, and of other worthies, both in Scotland and in England, need scarcely, at this period of temperance affairs, be alluded to—they, already, stand conspicuous on the record of an honest fame.

to which the Tradesmen contributed unnecessarily, as the Valuers of the Parish have since agreed there would not be one hand out of employ if the land was *profitably cultivated*. The loss of the Tradesmen was not confined to the rates they paid, being much greater in the loss on the sale of Manufactured Goods, which they would have had if this almost 5th part of the population of the parish had been allowed to work for the farmers, or been encouraged to rent Land for their own maintenance at spade husbandry, as one has done, who has consequently saved the parish 13*l.* since Michaelmas. In reference to the rental it appears that out of 4 Overseers for the ensuing year, though they rent upwards of 1000*l.*, only one possessed an inch of land, and he has only 8*l.* a-year to sink in value, as the rates rise. Thus the reason is apparent of the great pains these great farmers take to persuade Magistrates of the waste which might be committed by Tradesmen. Whether equally successful in other places may easily be ascertained by requesting two of the Resident Proprietors to make a Return thus—

The total rental of the Parish of \_\_\_\_\_ is £ \_\_\_\_\_ the amount of the last year's Poor Rates —s. —d. in the Pound.

	Owns as rated.			Rent as rated.		
1st. Overseer						
2d. ditto						
3d. ditto						
4th. ditto						

By what they *own* it will be seen to what amount they are interested in *reducing* the Rates; and by what they *rent*, it will be seen how much they are interested in *increasing* the fund which saves their own Capital in the payment of Wages.

Is it not under such influence that the Poor Law Commissioners act, in attempting to scotch, not to kill the snake? Surely this is a useless step, whilst power remains to seize its prey. Whereas it would be most easy to remove an evil that is the mere creature of Law, by changing the word OCCUPIER for PROPRIETOR, as in Scotland, where rents are well paid, and no hands are out of employ; by *Heritors being allowed to modify the alimnts they alone furnish*, for the tenants here acknowledge they do not furnish; the vast sums they pay having been allowed in the rent before they entered on their farms.

Enquiries addressed to Mr. J. STARR, East Bourne, Sussex, will be answered.

#### NOVEL MODE PROPOSED FOR TAKING ACCURATE LISTS OF DIVISIONS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SIR,

Croydon, April, 1834.

Presuming, from the Report of the Committee on this subject, that there is a difficulty in obtaining a correct and expeditious List of Voters on a Division of the House of Commons, allow me to submit a simple method of acquiring a fair printed List as readily as the names can be audibly called over; and, as this mode would afford any number of copies, it would prevent the many errors that now occur in public reports, and consequently do away with the odium to which members are now subject in consequence of being wrongly reported; which is often to the extent of representing them as voting in direct opposition to the pledges made by them to their constituents.

The method I beg to suggest is very simple, and I will describe it as concisely as possible. Let there be an alphabetical List of the whole of the Members of the House, divided into two parts, placed in a frame about the size of a common toilet-glass. Let the first part of the List, (say to K) be placed on the left hand side, and the other on the right, at the distance of about two feet from each other. Let there be horizontal grooves from each name, in which the name would slide. In these grooves let there be placed a small sliding stamp, in types, of each member's name, in an inverted position. In the centre of the two Lists, let there be placed a perpendicular groove for the fixed type to fall into; and so contrived as to allow the name, when moved into it, to fall below the horizontal grooves, to prevent impeding any other type.

This frame might be placed in the centre of the house, for the better hearing of those who had to direct it, and on a division, the names should be called out aloud. Two persons standing at the frame should then move the name when

called out, which would force the type into the perpendicular groove, until the whole should be called over. The type then to be made secure, the sliding groove drawn out, the printers' ink passed over it, put under a press, and in an instant a correct List of the Division would be obtained and printed, and this could be multiplied to any extent required.

I beg to submit the above observations to your consideration, and should you think the plan practicable you will, perhaps, submit it to the notice of the ingenious.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,  
W. G.

[We admire the ingenuity of the plan proposed by our Correspondent, and, therefore, we readily give it publicity. But we doubt its practicability, because the House is already too small for the accommodation of its members: and any framework or apparatus, wherever placed, would only increase the evil. The names could be *written* with sufficient rapidity by any skilful short-hand writer as fast as they could be called out, and when thus obtained could be multiplied with sufficient speed by hand for the press.—EDITOR.]

#### MOTIONS DEFERRED.

RELIEF FOR THE POLISH EXILES.—Mr. Buckingham.—While we write this, we do not know the issue of the discussion on the motion of Mr. O'Connell; but it is believed that it will extend even to Thursday evening; in which case the motion for an Address to the Crown on behalf of the Polish Exiles, fixed for that evening, will become what is called a "Dropped Motion," and cannot be brought on until some other open day, of which the previously crowded state of the Order Book presents little or no hope till June or July, if even then.

DRUNKENNESS.—Mr. Buckingham.—Select Committee, to inquire into the increase of drunkenness, and the best means of preventing its further spread, deferred from Tuesday, 20th of May, till Tuesday, 27th of May; the former day being Whitsun Tuesday, the House does not sit.

COPYRIGHT ACT.—Mr. Buckingham.—Bill to repeal so much of the Act 54 Geo. III., commonly called "The Copyright Act," as enjoins the delivery of eleven Copies of every Book and Volume for the eleven Public Libraries therein mentioned, excepting only one Copy to the British Museum, deferred from Tuesday 17th June, till Tuesday 24th June, to give precedence to Sir Samuel Whalley's motion on the Ballot, as he was otherwise without an open day.

#### DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

##### MINORITY of 84,

Tellers included, who, on the 21st of April, voted for Colonel Evans's clause for taking the vote by ballot in the borough of Hertford.

Aglionby, H. A.	Fenton, J.	Locke, W.	Seale, Colonel
Attwood, T.	Ferguson, Sir R.	Lloyd, J. H.	Sinclair, G.
Baines, E.	Fitzgerald, T.	Lynch, A. H.	Scholefield, J.
Barnett, C. J.	Fitzroy, Lord	Moreton, H.	Stanley, E. J.
Biddulph, R.	Fleming, Admiral	Mullins, F. W.	Sullivan, R.
Bellew, R. M.	Gaskell, D.	Ord, W. H.	Tennyson, C.
Bish, T.	Godson, R.	O'Connell, C.	Throckmorton, R.
Blake, M. J.	Grote, G.	O'Connell, Morgan	Tooke, W.
Blackburne, J.	Gully, J.	Parrott, J.	Torrens, Colonel
Bouverie, Capt.	Hall, B.	Pease, J.	Tynte, C. J. K.
Briggs, R.	Hardy, J.	Penleaze, J.	Vincent, Sir F.
Brotherton, J.	Hill, M. D.	Phillipotts, J.	Vigors, N. A.
Buckingham, J. S.	Hodges, L.	Philips, M.	Wallace, R.
Clay, W.	Hutt, W.	Potter, R.	Warburton, H.
Chaytor, Sir W.	Ilyett, W. H.	Pryme, G.	Wason, R.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Jacob, E.	Rider, T.	Watkins, J. L.
Dawson, E.	Jervis, J.	Rotch, B.	Waterpark, Lord
Divett, E.	Kemp, T. R.	Roche, D.	Wigney, I. N.
Dykes, F. L. B.	Keppell, Major, G. T.	Ruthven, E.	Wilbraham, G.
Etwall, R.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Ruthven, E. S.	Williams, Colonel
Faithfull, G.	Lister, E. C.	Russell, Lord	

TELLERS.—Evans, Colonel.—Bulwer, E. L.

## MINORITY OF 12,

Teller included, who, on the 18th of April, voted against the Grant to Maynooth College.

Agnew, Sir A.	Lefroy, A.	Mandeville, Lord	Sinclair, G.
Bateson, Sir R.	Lefroy, T.	Perceval, Colonel	Verner, Colonel
Knatchbull, Sir E.	Lowther, Colonel	Plumptre, J.	
	Teller.—Johnston, A.		

## MAJORITY OF 187,

Tellers included, who, on the 17th of April, voted for the admission of Dissenters to the Universities.

## ENGLAND.

Adams, E. H.	Divett, E.	Littleton, Hn. E. J.	Scrope, T.
Aglionby, H. A.	Ebrington, Viscount	Locke, W.	Sheppard, T.
Althorp, Lord	Ewart, W.	Lumley, Lord	Smith, V.
Baines, E.	Ellis, W.	Lushington, Dr.	Spankie, R.
Baring, F. T.	Fazakerly, J. N.	Mangles, J.	Spencer, Hon. Capt.
Baring, W. B.	Fellowes, H. A. W.	Majoribanks, S.	Stanley, E. J.
Bainbridge, E.	Fenton, J.	Marshall, J.	Stanley, Rt. Hn. E.
Barham, J.	Fitzroy, Lord C.	Milton, Viscount	Staunton, Sir G.
Barnard, E. G.	Fort, J.	Monckton, Hon. H.	Staveley, T. K.
Bewes, T.	Gaskell, D.	Morpeth, Viscount	Stewart, T. M.
Beaucherk, Major	Gisborne, T.	Morrison, J.	Strickland, Sir G.
Beaumont, T. W.	Gordon, R.	Mosley, Sir O.	Stuart, Lord D. C.
Bernal R.	Graham, Hon. Sir J.	North, F.	Strutt, E.
Biddulph, R.	Grant, Rt. Hon. C.	Ord, W.	Tancred, H. W.
Blackburne, J.	Grant, R.	Palmer, C. F.	Tayleur, W.
Bouverie, Captain	Grey, Sir G.	Parker, J.	Thomson, Rt. Hn. P.
Bolling, W.	Gronow, Captain	Parrott, J.	Todd, J. R.
Briggs, R.	Handley, Major	Pease, J.	Tooke, W.
Briscoe, J. I.	Hawes, B.	Pelham, Hon. C. A.	Torrens, Colonel
Brodie, W. B.	Heathcote, J.	Penlease, J. S.	Tower, C.
Brocklehurst, J.	Hill, M. D.	Pepys, Sir C.	Trelawney, Sir W.
Brotherton, J.	Hodges, T. L.	Peter, W.	Tynte, C. J. K.
Buckingham, J. S.	Howard, P. H.	Potter, R.	Vernon, Hon. G.
Bulwer, E. L.	Howard, Colonel R.	Philips, M.	Vincent, Sir F.
Buxton, F.	Howick, Viscount	Phillipotts, J.	Vivian, J. H.
Calvert, N.	Hume, J.	Pinney, W.	Wilbraham, G.
Carter, B.	Hutt, W.	Polter, J.	Wigney, I. N.
Cavendish, Lord	Hyett, W. H.	Rice, Hon. T. S.	Wilks, J.
Cayley, Sir G.	Jervis, J.	Richards, J.	Williams, Colonel
Cayley, E. S.	Kennedy, J.	Rickford, W.	Wood, G. W.
Chaytor, Sir W.	King, E. B.	Ridley, Sir M. W.	Wood, C.
Chichester, J. B.	Lambton, H.	Rolfe, R. M.	Walter, J.
Childers, J.	Labouchere, H.	Romilly, J.	Warburton, H.
Clay, W.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Romilly, E.	Warre, J. A.
Clive, C. B.	Langston, J. H.	Russell, Lord J.	Ward, H. G.
Codrington, Sir E.	Lemon, Sir C.	Russell, C.	Watkins, J. L. V.
Crawley, S.	Lefevre, C. S.	Russell, Lord C. J.	Wason, R.
Curteis, H. B.	Lennard, Sir T. B.	Sandford, E.	Wedgewood, J.
Dawson, F.	Lennard, T. B.	Scott, Sir C.	Whitmore, W.
Dundas, Captain	Lister, E.	Sebright, Sir J.	Whalley, Sir S.
			Young, G. F.

## SCOTLAND.

Callender, J. H.	Johnston, A.	Oliphant, L.	Sinclair, G.
Dunlop, J.	M'Kenzie, S.	Oswald, J.	Wallace, R.
Hay, Colonel L.			

## IRELAND.

Barron, H. W.	Evans, G.	Martin, J.	Ruthven, E. S.
Barry, G. S.	French, F.	O'Callaghan, Hn. C.	Ruthven, E.
Butler, Hon. J.	Hill, Lord M.	O'Connell, M.	Stawell, Colonel
Clements, Lord	Lambert, H.	O'Reilly, W.	Talbot, J.
Don, O'Conor	Lynch, A. H.	Perrin, L.	Vigors, N. A.

## MINORITY OF 46,

Tellers included, who, on the 17th of April, voted against the Admission of Dissenters to the Universities. 6

Banks, W.	Egerton, W.	Lefroy, A.	Ryle, T.
Baring, A.	Estcourt, T.	Lincoln, Lord	Somerset, Lord G.
Baring, F.	Feilden, W.	Lopez, Sir R.	Stanley, E.
Bell, M.	Finch, G.	Manners, Lord R.	Trevor, G. R.
Blackstone, W.	Gaskell, J. M.	Neale, Sir H.	Tyrell, Sir J.
Brudenell, Lord	Gladstone, W. E.	Nichol, J.	Vyvyan, Sir R.
Bruce, C.	Grimston, Viscount	Norreys, Lord	Whitmore, T. C.
Chetwynd, Captain	Hardinge, Sir H.	Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir R.	Wood, Colonel
Clive, R.	Hayes, Sir E.	Pigott, R.	Wynn, C.
Darlington, Lord	Herbert, Hon. T.	Perceval, Colonel	Young, T.
Duffield, T.	Harries, Hon. J. C.	Ross, C.	

TELLERS.—Inglis, Sir R.—Goulburn, Rt. Hon. H.

## MINORITY OF 141,

Teller included, who, on the 21st of April, voted against the paying 250,000*l.* a-year out of the Land-Tax in lieu of the Church-Rates.

Adams, E. H.	Fellowes, Hon. N.	Lloyd, J. H.	Staveley, J. K.
Aglionby, H. A.	Fenton, J.	Locke, W.	Stewart, J.
Bainbridge, E. T.	Fergusson, R. C.	Lynch, A. H.	Strutt, E.
Baines, E.	Fielden, J.	Martin, J.	Sullivan, R.
Baldwin, Dr.	Finn, W. F.	Molesworth, Sir W.	Sharpe, General
Barnard, E. G.	Fitzgerald, T.	Nagle, Sir R.	Scholefield, J.
Barron, W.	French, F.	O'Brien, C.	Sheil, R. L.
Bellew, R. M.	Fryer, R.	O'Connell, M.	Seale, Colonel
Bewes, T.	Fitzsimon, C.	O'Cannell, C.	Smith, Hon. R.
Bish, T.	Fitzsimon, N.	O'Connell, J.	Tennyson, Rt. Hon. C.
Blackney, W.	Gaskell, D.	O'Connor, Don	Thompson, Alderman
Blake, M. J.	Gillon, W. D.	O'Connor, F.	Todd, J. R.
Blamire, W.	Gisborne, T.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Tooke, W.
Bowes, J.	Godson, R.	O'Ferrall, M.	Torrens, Colonel
Briggs, R.	Grote, G.	Oliphant, L.	Trelawney, W.
Briscoe J. I.	Ghest, J. J.	Ord, W.	Turner, W.
Brocklehurst, J.	Gully, J.	Oswald, R.	Tynte, C. J. K.
Brotherton, J.	Hall, B.	Parrott, J.	Talbot, J. H.
Buckingham, J. S.	Handley, Major	Pease, J.	Vernon, G.
Bulwer, E. L.	Harvey, D. W.	Philips, M.	Vigors, N. A.
Butler, Hon. P.	Hawkins, J. H.	Pinney, W.	Vincent, Sir F.
Cayley, E. S.	Hodgson, J.	Potter, R.	Vivian, J. H.
Cayley, Sir G.	Hudson, T.	Pryme, G.	Walker, C. A.
Chapman, W. L.	Hutt, W.	Richards, J.	Wallace, R.
Clay, W.	Hyett, W. H.	Rippon, C.	Walter, J.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Hill, M. D.	Robinson, G. R.	Warburton, H.
Dalmeny, Lord	Ingham, R.	Roche, W.	Wason, R.
Dashwood, G. H.	James, W.	Roche, D.	Whalley, Sir S.
Davies, Col.	Jacob, E.	Rog, J.	Whitmore, W.
Divett, E.	Jervis, J.	Romilly, J.	Wigney, N.
Ellis, W.	Kemp, T. R.	Romilly, E.	Wilks, J.
Evans, G.	Kennedy, J.	Ronayne, D.	Williams, W.
Evans, Col.	Lambton, H.	Russell, Lord C.	Williams, Colonel
Ewart, W.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Russell, W. C.	Winnington, J. H.
Ewing, J.	Leech, J.	Ruthven, E. S.	Wood, Alderman
Faithfull, G.	Lister, E. C.	Ruthven, E.	Yelverton, Hon. W. H.

TELLER.—Hume J.

\* \* Several Communications have been received, and will appear at the earliest opportunity.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1834.

SKETCH OF THE RIGHT HON. THOMAS SPRING  
RICE, M.P. FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

As the recent debate on the Repeal of the Irish Union has brought Mr. Rice most prominently before the public, a Sketch of the personal and political history of that gentleman acquires a sort of derivative interest, to which intrinsically it would perhaps have no strong claim; for neither the personal nor political merits of the subject of this Memoir are of so eminent a character as to mark him out broadly and pre-eminently as one to whom the *digito monstrari et diciar hic est* can be justly applied. As the opponent of Mr. O'Connell on the question of Repeal, and as the challenger of the Hon. Member for Oldham,

“Encountering foot to foot, and hand to hand,  
With breast to breast opposed, and knee to knee,  
In all the fierce display of chivalry,”\*

the Member for the city of Cambridge will be in the mouths of all men; and it is fitting that the readers of THE PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW should know something of one who has thus occupied the public arena for six hours and a half in defence of the Irish Union.

Mr. Thomas Spring Rice was born in the county of Limerick, about six-and-forty years ago. According to Mr. O'Connell's account, his ancestors were small farmers—a race which pass in Ireland under the title of middlemen. Be this as it may, Mr. Rice's father at least ascended in the social scale above his immediate progenitors, for he had entered the University of Dublin as a Gentleman Pensioner about 1775, and was, we believe, in 1780, admitted to the Irish Bar.

The Bar of Ireland was then composed of a very different class of men from many of those who now invest themselves with an easy dig-

---

\* These were nearly the exact words of Mr. Rice last year, when, with more than the sincerity of wine—and all the valiancy of potten—he challenged Messrs. O'Connell and Cobbett to the war of words. The refusal of the former “to engage in a contest so unequal, for he must avow in sober sadness he had not dined,” was understood and cheered by the House. The ardour of the Right Hon. Secretary of the Treasury was on this occasion with difficulty kept in check by Lord Althorp and Sir James Graham.

nity in donning the wig and gown. At that epoch a domestic Parliament and a resident gentry gave to the business of the Irish Law Courts all the "pride, pomp, and circumstance" incident to the metropolis of an independent nation. The suits were not only heavy but long and important—the county magistrates were country gentlemen, not stipendiary police justices—and every family of consequence in the kingdom being either engaged in a law-suit, or looking to the law as an avenue leading to judicial or civil employment, it resulted that it was in some sort an aristocratic as it certainly was an honourable profession. The Grattans—the Ponsonbys—the Hutchinsons—the Currans—the Fitz-Gibbons, and others of this stamp were then ranked among the Irish bar. It was not as it is now divided into three sections of bigots, monopolists, and demagogues, who rising in the provinces into a bad eminence, call themselves the people, and factiously clamour till they are supplied at the ministerial board with such crumbs as an English treasury, seriously besieged with stout applicants at home, can afford to those provincial pests, who, at the end of the account invariably become the basest parasites of the minister, as in the beginning they start by being the loudest and most servile slaves and flatterers of the people. Of such a race, the middle classes of Britain should be forewarned; for they may rest assured that these men have but one unvarying object in view, and that is self-advancement at all hazards.

The elder Mr. Rice followed his profession for some years, but with no moderate, not to speak of brilliant success. At length, tired of toiling after the Munster circuit, he determined rather to mount his way by the ladder of matrimony than by the ladder of the law, and a rich heiress rewarded his diligent labours in the person of a Miss Spring. The name of this lady is now incorporated with the patronymic of Mr. Rice.

The early days of the Right Hon. Secretary were spent in Ireland, and his first instruction was received in that country. We are not aware whether he was at any public school in England; all that we know for certain is that about the year 1808, he was entered of Cambridge. We believe that he was a diligent and pains-taking young man while at the University, and that he moderately distinguished himself in the groves of the Academy. On the banks of the Cam his voice was first heard in the University Debating Club, and it was afterwards more frequently echoed in the Academical Society, which then held its meetings in Chancery-lane, London. After obtaining his degree, Mr. Rice had some thoughts of being called to the bar, but this project was afterwards—we know not why—abandoned, and we believe he never proceeded further in the forensic career than by placing his name on the books of one of the Inns of Court.

In 1812 or 13 Mr. Rice returned to Ireland, and occupied himself in his own county in the duties of a magistrate and country gentleman: In 1815 he gave to the world the fruits of his experience in a pamphlet, published on the Irish Grand Jury Laws, which contained certainly some valuable suggestions, and pointed out clearly the vices of the system, but which was, nevertheless, disfigured by the childish vanity of innumerable quotations from French, Italian, and Spanish, having little or nothing to do with the subject. This remark was made at the time by the *Quarterly Review*, but the critic, nevertheless, ad-

mitted that the author had made some useful exposures of a vicious system.

The native city of Mr. Rice had all this time groaned under the oppression of a corrupt family influence. The corporation, which was composed of a knot of individuals, banded together by a community of private interests and political feeling, had the sole power of returning members to Parliament; and it is needless to say, they abused this privilege to the great detriment of the residue of the citizens. To his credit be it spoken, Mr. Rice was the first who made a stand against this monopoly. Aided by the strenuous exertions of his fellow-citizens, who contributed not only by their purses, but by their active personal exertions, Mr. Rice came to the poll against the corporation candidate; but the Vereker party, long in possession of all the petty municipal offices of the city, greatly transcended their opponents in discipline and organization, though they were plainly inferior in point of numbers. The returning officer placed Mr. Rice's opponent at the head of the poll. Fortunately this adjudication was not final. A petition to the House of Commons was soon determined on, nor were funds to carry it to an issue—as is too often the case in Ireland—found wanting. A liberal sum was subscribed, and Mr. Rice, with his witnesses, proceeded to London. A committee was appointed on Tuesday, the 25th of February, 1819, of which Sir Thomas Baring was the chairman, to try the merits of the question. Mr. Nicholson Calvert was chosen by Mr. Rice as his nominee; while his opponent, Mr. Prendergast Vereker, was ably assisted by the present Lord Farnham, then known as Colonel Barry. On the 1st of March, and after hearing counsel on both sides, the committee resolved that the Honourable Prendergast Vereker was duly elected, and that the petition of T. S. Rice did not appear to be frivolous or vexatious.

Nothing daunted by this first failure, Mr. Rice again came forward at the general Election which took place in 1820. He was on this occasion declared by a Committee of the House of Commons to have been duly elected. Mr. Rice made his maiden speech in 1821. For an Irishman it was considered a happy effort. It contained infinitely less of assertion than the efforts of Irish orators in general; and had in it much less of declamation than is usual in the speeches of gentlemen from the other side of the Channel. There was, moreover, a judicious mixture of fact and argument, and a moderation of tone and manner which were of happy augury.

The House of Commons was at this period very nearly destitute of Irish talent. With the exception of Sir John Newport, Sir Henry Parnell, and the Knight of Kerry, there were not perhaps three of the Irish Members who could command a hearing for five minutes. The House was, on this account, the more pleased with the Member for Limerick; and it was predicted that he would soon occupy the place of the venerable Newport, who was waxing old in the service of his country. It was conceived in Ireland, that Mr. Rice would be a most valuable ally on local questions, and that his countrymen, no longer under the necessity of appealing to Englishmen to bring forward their grievances, would find a native Member willing and able to undertake this duty. Nor were the Irish in this respect mistaken. Mr. Rice did certainly pay the most sedulous attention to local matters, and by his



information and diligence, acquired the confidence, not only of the House, but of his constituents, and the country at large.

He proceeded steadily in this course, voting almost always with the Whig party, till the period of his visit to Ireland in 1823, when he was entertained by his constituents at a public dinner, and, we believe, also by the Members of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Dublin.

It would be uninteresting to our readers to go over the senatorial career of Mr. Rice, in detail. Suffice it to say, that he proved himself on most occasions, a useful and efficient Member, and on Irish questions in particular, he displayed much local knowledge, divested of the exaggeration of local prejudice.

When Mr. Canning was appointed to office in 1827, Mr. Rice was one of those Members who crossed the House to support that gentleman. Disappointed, however, in his expectation of office, and still more so in not receiving an increased allowance from his father, he prepared to leave England as Secretary to Lord William Bentinck, then appointed Governor General of India. It was painful to see a man who had given seven of the best years of his life to the public service, thus obliged to expatriate himself; but Mr. Rice alleged that his first duty was towards his family, and that unless he accepted this appointment, he would be unable to send his eldest boy (whom he had hitherto himself instructed) to Eton. These facts were forcibly represented by political friends, to the elder Mr. Rice, who consented to make his son an increased allowance out of his very considerable income.

Shortly after this period, the present Earl of Ripon succeeded to the Premiership. Under his brief administration, Mr. Rice, for a short period, filled the office of Secretary to the Treasury Board, which he resigned on the appointment of the Duke of Wellington to office, in the year 1829. In the latter end of 1830, he was again appointed Secretary to the Treasury, a place which he still continues to fill.

It will naturally be inquired whether Mr. Rice's acceptance of office for the second time met with the approbation of his first constituents, the citizens of Limerick. We believe we are correct in saying that it did. The people of Ireland hailed with one acclaim the advent of the Whigs to power, in the hope—the vain hope—as time, alas! has since proved—that they would really do something to ameliorate the condition of the great mass of the people; but these fond day-dreams, like many others of no very old date, have all been cruelly dispelled. It was now clear enough that all loud-tongued zeal is not public virtue—that all busy suspicion of adverse parties is not patriotism—but the cloak whereby men obtain a confidence which they betray, and an ascendancy which they abuse. Never does elevation sit worse than on inferior minds. Inflated with extravagant ideas of self, the small statesman too often imagines that he is the centre around which a great system revolves. Like the fly in the fable he fancies it is his volition that impels the chariot-wheel, whereas in reality he is but an insignificant insect humming and buzzing about the centre of life and motion. While the wheel of Reform was running its course in Ireland, Mr. Spring Rice was the identical fly importantly settled on the tire. To believe himself, whether delivered orally or with stroke of pen, *his* was the hand which put all in motion; and he prayed, implored,

and commanded, that all good patriots would exert themselves in their private spheres, as he did in his public one. These words were not lost on his constituents. The citizens of Limerick were among the most active in the good cause; but the battle once won, the zeal of Mr. Rice sunk below the freezing point—his energy slackened apace; and the man who, but one little month before had “nods and becks, and wreathed smiles”<sup>\*</sup> for the costermonger and dealer in marine stores,<sup>\*</sup> was now formal as a precisian—grave as a Grand Seigneur of the court of the great Dauphin—and diplomatical as the supple Gondomar himself. In a word, he had sucked the orange, and now he flung the useless rind away. But the men of Limerick were not thus to be trifled with. The spirit of “Garry Owen” was awakened, and it was conveyed most contumeliously to Mr. Rice, that he might save himself the trouble of again burdening Limerick with his presence.

The Treasury Secretary was now convinced “that the smallest worm will turn being trodden on.” We do not envy him his meditations as he reflected on the un courteous answers he had often returned to the sober inquiries of his constituents—and the haughty bearing which drew down on him this their severe rebuke. It must, indeed, have been galling to the mind of any man to have been flung off as one thoroughly known and distrusted. A proud man with the *mens conscia recti* may laugh to scorn an unmerited rebuke, but a vain man, who is conscious of having merited the expression of contumelious feelings, must undergo a severe punishment indeed.

Rejected at Limerick, the Treasury Secretary presented himself to the burgesses of Cambridge; but even here, with all the Treasury influence, the ground was contested step by step against him by Sir Edward Sugden. Had a really popular Tory presented himself at Cambridge, the chances are that he would have succeeded; but it is needless to say that the personal bearing of Sir Edward is still more unpopular and repulsive than that of Mr. Spring Rice; while his principles are so ultra as to astound reasonable men of whatever sect or party. This is the real secret of Mr. Rice’s success. Let him not lay “the flattering unction to his soul” that it was his popularity and public character, or that of his patrons, which secured his return; for it was in fact the admitted ultra-toryism and unpopularity of his opponent.

It remains for us to say a few words as regards the oratorical manner and general bearing of the Hon. Member for Cambridge, and especially in reference to his last and longest speech, the reply to Mr. O’Connell. The great defects of Mr. Rice, as they appear to us, are his flippancy and general want of power. There is an absence of gravity and sustained seriousness, which greatly detract from the little that he says well;—but it would be very unfair to deny him the praise of great industry, very general knowledge, and a minute acquaintance with details. Of power of mind—in the enlarged sense of the word—Mr. Rice has not given any proof. He cannot grasp the whole of a subject, nor even present the main and leading features in a vivid and striking light; but he can perceive the weak points in an opponent, and bring a num-

---

<sup>\*</sup> This is the appellation for the *Chiffonniers* of London—the dealers in “bits of brass, broken glass, and old iron.”

ber of small details to bear against the flanks of an enemy. He knows the temper and prejudice of the House well; and can as dexterously lay the ground for a 'dap-trap' as most men: but these, after all, are petty contrivances, which a higher intellect would disdain. Among 658 individuals, swayed by human interests and human passions, such a man has his weight; and it would be vain to deny that he is not of considerable service to the Whigs on all occasions, and one of their most valuable allies.

In the reply made to Mr. O'Connell's speech, on the Repeal of the Union, Mr. Rice had, in every respect, great superiority over his opponent. His manner was the best we have ever seen him exhibit: his matter was the fruit of much research, and strictly to the purpose: and having the sympathy of the large majority of his auditors, the countenance of the Government, and a consciousness of winning the ear and approbation of the country, he spoke as one full of the consolation and strength which all these advantages gave him. The speech, it is true, was much too long: but a reply to a speech of five hours and a half could not be shorter, if it answered the points in the original address:—but though Mr. Rice was six hours and a half on his legs—and without any interval or break, to repose—the attention of his hearers was kept alive to the last; and the speaker, though a person of slender frame, and with nothing indicative of physical strength in his exterior, spoke on to the last without any appearance of fatigue, and was as fresh at the close, as he was at the commencement of his very long, and unquestionably very able oration.

#### EVILS OF THE CORN LAWS.

Were food as cheap in England as it is in other manufacturing countries, it would be practicable to secure to the operative classes, in England, a higher rate of real wages *within the limit* of the superiority, which more efficacious labour, cheaper fuel and carriage, and better machinery, all contribute to confer upon England, in producing goods for the foreign market. But while the value of food in England is artificially raised above its value in those other manufacturing countries, which are our competitors in the foreign market, such an improvement in the rate of real wages is morally impossible. Until an alteration in the Corn Laws shall have secured us against foreign competition, all projects for raising wages will be found erroneous in principle, and ruinous in practice.—*Colonel Torrens.*

#### RICARDO'S THEORY OF RENT.

MR. RICARDO, in developing his theory, assumes that there is a natural inequality in the returns for equal quantities of capital or labour on lands of different fertilities, rich land yielding more and poor land less produce; but this is not necessarily true. It is true only when the parties are restricted to equal *extents* of land. Suffer one party to have double the quantity of land, only a little inferior in fertility, and he *might* obtain a greater return for equal labour than could be obtained from the smaller quantity of more fertile land. If the party using the best land has as great an extent as can be beneficially used by his labour, while the other party is obliged to go to poorer land, it is a consequence of the former having a monopoly of the rich land, that is, of having an *exclusive* right to it; and all the advantage which he obtains is the result of that monopoly, and not of any natural inequality in the returns from equal quantities of labour; for, were it not for this monopoly, labour would not go to the poorer land, where it could obtain only a smaller return, but would employ itself on the rich land, where it could get the larger return.—*Hopkins's Great Britain for the last Forty Years.*

## POLISH EXILES IN ENGLAND—DETACHMENT OF POLES AT PORTSMOUTH.

---

AMONG the forty or fifty motions which stood upon the Order Book of the House of Commons for the last and present week, all of which have been “swamped” by the six nights’ discussion on the Repeal of the Irish Union—and for which, the crowded state of that Book to the end of the session, affords little or no hope of finding a subsequent opening, so as to bring them forward on any future evening—was one for an “Address to the Crown, praying His Majesty to extend his royal bounty to the Polish Exiles now in England, and pledging the House to make good such sum as His Majesty might be pleased to direct to be appropriated to that purpose.” As it happens, however, nothing has been lost by the “swamping” of this motion, at least; for we have since learnt, that if no other obstacle had intervened, the Ministers would not have *allowed* it to be discussed, though permission had been given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to have the notice of motion entered in the *votes* of the day. It is a rule of the House, that no application for a grant of money, whether by bill, resolution, or address, can be made without the previous consent of the Crown, through the Ministers; and this being known, that consent was asked and obtained for this notice of motion to be entered for the 24th of April. But though it was, of course, concluded that this permission implied a willingness to let the question be *discussed*—for without this, the notice itself would be useless—it is now ascertained, that notwithstanding such permission, the Cabinet had subsequently resolved *not* to grant relief to the Polish Exiles, nor even to permit the question to be discussed in any form that would admit of a division; so that the feeling of the House cannot now be ascertained by a vote on the subject.

We believe, therefore, that it is the intention of those who feel most deeply interested on behalf of these unhappy Exiles to hold a Public Meeting in London, and submit their case to the generosity of the English people; so as at once to afford to these noble victims of the purest patriotism some small portion of relief; and at the same time to proclaim to the civilized world, that however much the British Government may dread doing any thing that shall give offence to Russia (and there is no other conceivable motive for the conduct of the Government than this), the British people have so much more *virtue* than their rulers, that they will themselves come forward individually to do their duty as men and Christians towards fellow-beings in distress; and so much more *courage* than their governors, that they will proclaim on the four winds of Heaven their hated detestation of Russian tyranny, and their defiance and contempt of Russian power.

Under these circumstances, and as an appropriate preparation for

such a meeting, we embrace the opportunity of giving some account of the condition of a detachment of Polish Exiles now at Portsmouth, whom we have had an opportunity of seeing, on a recent visit to that port during the Easter Recess, and who have hitherto been sustained entirely by the chivalrous generosity of the liberal inhabitants of Portsmouth and its neighbourhood; without whose timely bounty they must have absolutely perished. Our account of them will be drawn from an able and interesting Statement of their Case, from the pen of a young and ardent friend of liberty, residing at Portsea, who has contributed by his purse to relieve their necessities, as well as by his pen to make them known. We give below the most important portions of his letter, and leave them to make their due impression on the public mind.

'Before the facts which regard the Poles, since their arrival at Portsmouth, are adverted to, it may be as well to state, generally, how they, or others of their countrymen, were treated when in Prussia, and under what circumstances the Poles now here left that country. They, with others their comrades, escaped thither for a refuge, after the fortunes of war had turned against them. Such, indeed, is the law of brute force; unequal numbers may ultimately overcome superior principle, when it is obliged to fight with physical weapons. At first, it was attempted to drive them back into Poland. In pursuance of this plan, the Polish soldiers were ordered to cross the frontiers into their own territory. They well knew, that to be once again *there*, would be to take the first step to the snows and the cruelties of Siberia. They refused; the Prussians resorted to force; and a great number of the Poles were killed or wounded in the attempt to drive them into their own country! Those who remained, resolved to die on the threshold of Poland. Tyranny quailed at the sublime decision of such cool and heroic fortitude. It drew back at the daring of men who could die in the sight of their ruined country, but who would not live in willing slavery. Prussia then received them; but as rebels. They laboured along with convicted criminals on the public works. At the congress of Münchengratz, however, it was decided that attempts should again be made to get them out of Prussia. They were then, for this purpose, treated with. Pretty reciprocity for a contract! As a choice of alternatives, the one being nominally reception into Poland, but really, in their opinion, banishment to Siberia, or a fate no better, and the other a passage to America—thousands of miles from their homes and from Europe. They naturally adopted the latter. But Heaven interposes. One ship is driven to Havre; and the generous French, in spite of the authorities, *would* receive the unfortunate Poles; another is taken into Harwich; and a third to Portsmouth. Of the latter band, consisting of 212, including two officers, the writer now more particularly speaks.

Immediately on their arrival in a port of England, *they resolved, if possible, to be free.* Where is the Englishman who will blame them for making the noble resolve, justly complimentary as it is to our beloved country? They protested in writing against the extorted arrangements, which were made in a state which they considered as *duress*. America is a fine and a happy land; but it is on the other side of the world. Were they to blame that they clung, with tenacity, at least to Europe? In this refusal, however, to go across the Atlantic, they acted upon the

dictates of their own judgment and policy, as Poles. They neither did consult, nor were counselled in that, by Englishmen, at Portsmouth. The contrary winds were most extraordinarily prolonged—another remarkable circumstance in the “strange eventful history” of this little patriot band. They availed themselves of the necessary delay to make a formal application to the French Government, to be received into France, along with their compatriots already in that country. Before any answer had been received to this request, the wind changed. The Prussian captain of the vessel must perform his mercantile contract; at least, so said the London agents, who came down to Portsmouth to insist upon the punctual performance of his engagement. It is not intended to blame him, under all circumstances, for an act which he considered to be done in discharge of his duty; his conduct, perhaps, was natural enough. But the poor Poles had *their* duty, which was of a more exalted and moral character, to perform as well. Without positive or offensively aggressive violence, they, by passive force, resisted the attempt to transport them, against their will, thousands of miles from Europe. What Briton, under similar circumstances, would not have done likewise?

It is important, here, to notice under what circumstances, and by whose persuasion and management, they *actually landed* in England. If their case should ever lead to diplomacy, the facts now to be stated must not be forgotten. Much as the writer would deprecate any positive measures of undue influence, much less of force, to prevent the landing, yet he is not blind to the responsibility which might have been incurred by any persons who should have gone out of their way, unnecessarily, to invite a body of foreigners, without certain prospects of support, on the English territory. On the other hand, it would have been cruel and unworthy of Britons, to have withheld all sympathy and attention, under the ignoble, petty, selfish policy of frowning these brave men, as it were, from our shores. The Prussian captain or his advisers, however, have saved any one else from even the just suspicion of having undertaken undue responsibility. Vainly miscalculating on the power of endurance of men who were long accustomed to misfortune and cruelty, they determined on the expedient of removing from the ship the provisions which had been freighted for the support of the Poles. Whether it was really supposed that this course would induce them to alter, unwillingly, and with reluctance, their determination, it is not for the writer to say: the actual result was, that the Poles being still on board, and yet indisposed to go to America, it was discovered then that the possession of the ship was worth bargaining for; and after this gentle method of constraint had been experimented without effect, they were treated with. Pretty reciprocity, again, for a contract! It was arranged, that the Prussian captain, or his agents or advisers, should, on condition of the Poles landing, and giving up possession of the vessel, provide them with lodging and provisions for a certain time—it is believed eight days; and, in pursuance of an arrangement of this sort, they landed, and entered the lodgings taken for them, not by the inhabitants of Portsmouth, but by the Prussian captain or his agents. This simple fact is all-important, and must always be so considered, with regard to whatever may be the future consequences or difficulties arising out of their landing.

The people of Portsmouth and Portsea, to their great honour, finding that they had the brave but unfortunate soldiers of Poland with them, were immediately alive to their duty and to their character as Englishmen. Without any *particular* encouragement from the authorities, the people of Portsmouth and Portsea, by their own subscriptions, assisted by those of other benevolent individuals in the neighbourhood and elsewhere, have hitherto supported these interesting Exiles. Not the rich and the great alone have contributed; but perhaps many a hard-earned shilling has been dropped into the subscription-boxes by the artisan or labourer, who has joyfully offered his honest mite—a deed worthy of his character, but unknown to fame. The very children at the schools have put to shame others, who, though older, may be less informed or more apathetic. It is to be hoped, that the Corporation of Portsmouth, long known as an uncorrupt body of liberal politicians, will, when the entire list of subscribers shall be published, be found at the head of it, both in respect of time and amount; thus being, as a Corporation with public funds ought to be, leaders, and not followers, of their fellow-townsmen in every thing that is good and public-spirited. The representatives of the borough have honoured themselves by subscribing. The officers and others of our brave army, now in the garrison, without in the slightest degree having committed themselves imprudently, or to aught but acts of soldierly humanity, have treated the Poles and their officers with the greatest kindness, delicacy, and propriety. There has, in fact, speaking generally, been a cordial sympathy expressed towards them by all classes. The ladies especially, knowing well that their sex was honoured in the enthusiastic self-denying conduct of the Polish females during the late contest, have also acted with the most praiseworthy humanity. Did not many a beautiful, intelligent British female shed a tear over the fate of Poland, when she learnt that the cause was once more, for a time, unfortunate? It has been said, that the English are cold and phlegmatic: it is not so; they are only deliberate and cautious in adopting the occasion for the display of feeling. In short, the civil and moral character of our country has been well sustained by the inhabitants of the far-famed port whence the fleets of Nelson have often sailed, and to which they have returned in all their glory.

In the mean time—the Poles at Portsmouth having applied formally to the French Government to be received into France with their compatriots already there—instead of their receiving any direct answer to their specific application through the channel in which they expected it, a correspondence was opened with them, evidently proceeding on the assumption, which was incorrect, that the Poles at Portsmouth had applied to be received into the service of the foreign legion of France, or, in other words, to go to Algiers. If those at Harwich had done so, it was not the case with those at Portsmouth: still, over and over again, against their assertions to the contrary, as to the nature of their application, they were asked, if they persisted in their intention to enter the foreign legion of France. This made them fear that intrigue was going on, or something not sufficiently direct and ingenuous, or something marvellously erroneous. Is it any wonder that they did not decide to go? Subsequently, being in correspondence with persons of their own nation whom they considered entitled to offer counsel, they were advised not to throw away their lives among

the Arabs by going to Algiers: not, at any rate, until the government, and after them, the people, of France and England, had previously pronounced the stern decree for their departure from the shores of Europe.

The practical question then seems to be, are they, by undue persuasion, or by cold neglect, to depart *unwillingly* to Algiers? Must they fight, not in the cause of freedom, or even of natural right,—though it may be supposed to be ultimately promotive of civilization,—without the most indirect hope, in consequence of their so doing, of any result favourable to their own country? Can any one doubt what their melancholy fate will be, if they enter such a service? Some of the most gallant and well-disciplined soldiers of the Polish army will be killed in fighting with the Bedouins, against whom they have no enmity. By these means, or the climate, unfavourable perhaps to the natives of their cold regions, their little band will soon be extinct. If it were a matter of mere personal interest, *as men*, it is admitted that they perhaps could not complain of a lot which was shared by the soldiers of France. But the latter are extending the territories and the influence of their country, under the direction and policy of a government to which they owe allegiance. On the principles of personal feeling alone, it is admitted, that the Poles having lost their country and their liberty, might either while away their time in the prairies of America, or even rest content to end a life of bravery and virtue, whose only reward from the civilized world would have been a scornful banishment from its shores, by the warrior's death, though in a mercenary service. They would thus soon terminate all their wrongs, leaving them to be avenged by a just Providence, at a future day, in the resurrection of Poland. Eternal justice may take its own time, and deal inscrutably with nations, as with individuals; but it never sleeps unregardingly, but will ultimately vindicate the right.

If the ministers of England, in any official communication, should have expressed a wish that these men might be induced to go off to America, after they had protested against the plan to send them there, it is to be hoped that it was only a matter of formal, cold, prudent diplomacy. Surely the English government can never have united, indirectly, with the policy of the French government (involving also a still more ignoble submission to that of Russia), to get these Polish soldiers to Algiers. Can it be possible, that the English government has been aware of the wish of the French to get the actual services of these men, to aid that power in establishing and extending, as has been considered a colony along the shores of the Mediterranean? Although it is admitted, that necessarily banded together as are England and France in their European policy, there may not be so much objection to the colonization by the latter of Algiers, as was at first supposed, since it may be ultimately favourable to the cause of civilization; yet, if the English government, after having, under two different administrations, diplomatically protested against the probable attempt by France to create a colony, and having been assured, both by the governments of Charles X. and Louis Philippe, that there was no such intention, should have winked at the notorious wish to retain those men for military service at Algiers, it will, at least, be a matter requiring some *explanation*.

Hitherto, the subject has been considered without reference to the



engagements, either special or implied, of England with regard to Poland. A well-known stipulation in the treaty of Vienna, positively engages that the kingdom of Poland shall be an independent state; and a constitution, including the general principles of a free government, was pledged, as a condition of the arrangement by which the Emperor of Russia was to be king, on the public faith of the high contracting powers. This, too, was not only a matter of mere guarantee, but a positive principle, forming one of the equitable considerations of the settlement of Europe, by which peace was secured. Poland was intended as a barrier, an intermediate territory between the regions of Muscovite despotism and the land of freedom in the West of Europe. Russia has torn this treaty, like so much waste paper, in our very faces, with the most scornful disregard, not only of justice to the Poles, but of common honour and respect towards England and France. The Czar—the emperor of slaves and serfs—has bearded the present regal successors of Henry IV. and Elizabeth. Not only is the age of chivalry gone, but it would seem that even the sense and the pride of national independence are rapidly departing.

But, although on the principle adverted to, England and France should not be considered as *mere* guarantees for Poland; yet, in all equity, they are *such peculiarly*; and England, most of all, should, as a matter of the nicest national honour, be specially considered the legal and moral guarantee of the liberties and independence of Poland; for *her* best statesmen had always professedly condemned the previous partitions of that ill-fated country, as being the most shameless breaches of public morality recorded in the history of civilized nations.

If the above arguments respecting the moral obligation of the treaty be just, have not the Poles, who have been cast providentially on our shores, a claim of *justice*, both on England and France? If so, is the condition of our performing an act which is alike one of humanity and justice, to be the assumption and the exercise of a control and influence over the Poles, to send them away, against their views and feelings, even if mistaken, to be sacrificed, as they think, at Algiers? These men, therefore, are *not* unprincipled adventurers, or accidental wanderers,—mere *beggars*, and dependents on our *charity*, without possessing any equitable claims on the Government and the British people. Every one of them brings, for all he asks or gets, as it were, his promissory note in his hand—the treaty—to which England, ever faithful to its honour, is the guarantee.

Another consequence of the violation of the treaty is, that the insurrection of the Poles was more *evidently* lawful. It would have been justifiable and praiseworthy, independently of the specific breach of faith, since they were contending for the inalienable rights of man, the primary principles of political liberty; to say nothing of their claim, not only on Russia, but on the whole of civilized Europe, for the redress of wrongs perpetrated in the repeated partitions of Poland. But the gross forfeiture and non-observance of all the treaties, pledges, and even oaths, of the Russian Emperors in favour of the Polish constitution, removes even the shadow of a doubt as to the character of the contest. On the strictest principles of international law, it was, on the part of the Poles, justifiable civil war, and *not* rebellion. The latter is a crime, as it is defined to be the resistance of *lawful* authority. On this subject, it will be sufficient to refer to Vattel, b. iii, ch. xviii, § 292.

The Poles now here are *not*, then, as they have been ignorantly and ungenerously called—*rebels*. Whoever thus designates them, commits a libel, not so much against them, as on the sacred name of liberty itself. Robert Bruce, William Wallace, and John Hampden, were rebels; and Bannockburn, Marston-Moor, and Naseby, are no longer consecrated ground. George Washington was a rebel, and the enlightened patriots who signed the declaration of American independence, are degraded to the level of Wat Tyler and Thistlewood. Nothing can be more dangerous in its moral effect than to apply to virtue and heroism the nomenclature of vice.

Another legitimate effect of the treaty is, that the Poles ought not, in justice, to be considered as standing, with regard to England, in the same situation exactly with other refugees, defeated enemies of another state. It is laid down, undoubtedly, by juriconsults, that one nation has no right to receive the defeated enemies of another, with the probable effect of enabling them to make a future attack. It may, perhaps, be doubted, if this ought not to be mainly applicable, as between nations, to the foreign enemies of one of them: It would be unjust to apply it, at any rate, with any thing like strictness, to refugees defeated in a civil war, their cause being just; for, even without the existence of previous treaties in favour of the cause of the refugees, every nation not only has a right, but if it is nobly governed, will avow its obligation, to act in its conduct towards the unfortunate defeated, in relation to the eternal principles of right involved in the contest. But, at any rate, in the present instance, though England may justifiably prescribe the abstinence by the Poles from any measures which would involve this country in a fair charge of a breach of the neutrality she may profess, she can never allow the strict application of the general rule adverted to, in the case of refugees who are defeated by superior numbers, in a contest waged for the redress of a violated and still disregarded treaty, to which England, at the time it was made, was the party most *dependent upon* for its maintenance. At least, it would be her duty, if her national independence is any thing but a name, to meet any remonstrances or intimations on this point, if Russia should make them, by a determined counter-demand of the entire reinstatement and restoration of Poland and its constitution, as stipulated for in the treaty.

Is England, united with France, afraid to take this stand on the plain ground of common justice? Does she shrink before Russia? Is that colossal power to shut up the Dardanelles, and make the Euxine a fishing-pond? Shall she proceed, coolly and unchecked, in her nefarious process of Polish denationalization? Shall barbarism, like a pestiferous upas tree, be positively transplanted, in the nineteenth century, in the very midst of Europe? Shall the modern Attila, as he has been well styled, be so sovereign as to be allowed to be ever and anon loading the broken, bended backs of England and France, with the heap of antiquated diplomacy called international law, while with all the freedom of tyranny, he "will not so much as touch it with one of his fingers?" Is he to stuff Puffendorf and Grotius down their throats, while he tramples their treaty in the dust, under his feet? Does the British lion cower at the growling of the northern bear? Is the glorious standard of Britain to be lowered to the uplifted eagle of Russia? Is the guardian of the trident to submit to the hero of the knout? Peace is a great blessing, not heedlessly to be risked, but to be main

tained as long as possible, in consistency with national honour. But let us only whisper, with the still small voice of faithful warning, into the ears of the Holy Alliance, the ominous words of Canning—"The next war in Europe will be a war of opinions." The court of Belshazzar, when Daniel interpreted the awful announcements of the hand-writing on the wall, was not more a scene of prostrate terror and wild consternation, than will be the court of St. Petersburg, whenever the foreign minister of England shall rise, in all the might of this enfranchised and reformed nation, and boldly say, "We are prepared for war; but if it is commenced, it will be one of principle and opinion—a struggle of liberty against force."

It seems that the Government can hold out no hope of support. They are afraid it will be difficult to make a distinction between these and other refugees. There are at least some very obvious *distinctions* applicable to the case of the Polish soldiers recently arrived at Portsmouth. They have not sought the English shore. They are transported, under the decree of Münchengratz—exiled from Europe, because they would not be treated as rebels and traitors in their own country, *having been defeated in a just civil war*. They are cast into our port by *Providence*: they are landed on our soil by the compulsion of threatened starvation. The states of Russia and Prussia, in these acts of transportation, crimes as they are, independently of all treaties, against the civilization and social principles of Europe, have put themselves beyond the power of justifiable remonstrance on account of the consequences. England and France were bound, not only by the treaty, but as the natural protectors and guardians of European liberty, to have interposed, to prevent the dispersion of an independent nation which they had been instrumental, with others, in creating. Better never to have made the attempt. If Poland had been left to Russia, the surrendered prey of the spoiler, who can tell, with no cruel and flattering hopes induced by the known characters of France and England, but that the spirit of Poland, being left without the incumbrance of an imposed protection, would have risen then, in the might of its disappointment, and have achieved its freedom? Europe has enjoyed twenty years of peace, while Poland has been pining in neglect and desertion, and, politically speaking, in chains. Russia accumulates power, and pounces on its struggling prey: England looks on; and her minister comforts the wandering fugitives with speeches of sympathy and regret!

But supposing that, ultimately, the Government will do nothing, yet, will the public-spirited, wealthy, and independent people of London and Manchester, Liverpool and Bristol, Birmingham, Leeds, Sheffield, Hull, and Portsmouth, *suffer* these gallant and virtuous men to be either unwillingly forced from our shores, or to pine, in want, in the land of freedom? Thank God! we have at last, after our struggles, got the Reform Bill; and the English are still a people of generosity, humanity, and honour. It is not the economists, and the honest and industrious, who most feel the pressure of taxes, that are wanting in high-mindedness and proper national feeling. Why, the sinecure of the governorship of Portsmouth, which the illustrious Duke of Gloucester has held, would go far towards sustaining this brave and unfortunate band for a twelvemonth! Our own honest poor know well, that what the unfortunate foreigner, the persecuted refugee, may

get, will *not be taken from them*; and that their names and misfortunes are hypocritically made use of, sometimes, not to aid or commiserate *them*, but to *save pockets*, to which they never have been, nor are *intended to be, debtors*. The friend to justice and humanity towards the persecuted foreigner was never found wanting to the cry of distress at home. Generosity never yet hardened the heart; and a cheerful giver has generally something to give.'

The feeling of the people of England has not been mistaken; for though so many appeals have been made to it, and every appeal has been so well answered before, we are proud to see that it still responds as loudly and as cordially as ever. Among a number of petitions that have been sent up to Parliament in support of the motion intended to have been brought forward by us, for relief to the Polish Exiles, and which was defeated from the causes already described, we select one from the town of Hull, forwarded to us by Mr. Edward Buckton, the zealous and indefatigable Secretary to the Polish Society at that spirited and liberal port, which ranked the foremost in this holy cause: till Portsmouth has placed itself upon a level with its sister-port, and the south and the east of England now vie with each other in the renown of good deeds. We have no doubt this petition will be followed by others; and in the hope that this Statement will have its weight in preparing the way for the great Public Meeting intended to be convened in London, we add the statements of this petition from Hull, to the citations from the Letter on the Case of the Poles at Portsmouth, in the assurance that thousands by whom both will now be read, will heartily join in their united prayer.

To the Right Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned inhabitants of Kingston-upon-Hull:

SHewETH,

That your petitioners consider the crimes committed against unoffending Poland to be unexampled in the records of the darkest age, and the cruelties accumulated upon her devoted people to be without parallel in the history of the most barbarous states; and they think that if infamy attach to the authors of so monstrous a tragedy as the deliberate destruction of a great Christian nation, the passive spectators of its successive acts have incurred a grievous share in the guilt and the responsibility.

That the reiterated efforts of the Poles to assert their independence, and to vindicate their rights and liberties, whilst they evince a spirit of nationality not to be extinguished by ages of oppression, and indicate the most indomitable resolution eventually to be free, furnish sublime examples of virtue worthy of the world's admiration; and that the last revolution was a glorious attempt to consummate what the virtuous Kosciuszko had left unachieved: therefore, that to stigmatise the patriots of Poland as *rebels* to the Russian Czar, is to mock the understanding and to outrage truth by sophistry but too characteristic of its source.

That the admiration and sympathy which your petitioners entertained for the Poles during their late gigantic struggle have not been abated by their subsequent misfortunes, but, on the contrary, have been increased by meditating on the fortitude evinced by them under the systematic cruelties of which they are the victims.

That the patriotic Poles are now driven from almost every corner of the continent, and, to the disgrace of humanity, to the dishonour of civilization, to the everlasting reproach of Christian states—are actually hunted down and exterminated like wild beasts, by the confederated powers which originally dismembered Poland, destroyed the balance of power in Europe, and subverted equally

all moral and national law ; powers which but lately threatened the existence of France and Belgium, and at this moment menace the liberties of every European state, harass and impede the commerce of Great Britain, and evidently meditate designs upon our possessions in the East.

That Great Britain appears likely to become the last if not the sole asylum in Europe for the persecuted Polish Refugees, and your petitioners confidently hope that she will not discredit her ancient hospitality.

That, as it is incumbent on Christians individually to succour their afflicted brethren, so it behoves Christian states to succour an afflicted nation ; that the charity afforded to the wretched is ever accompanied by its proper reward, and that Great Britain, as she has always been the asylum of the persecuted and destitute stranger, has invariably been benefited by the protection and immunities which have been granted ; that the brightest periods of our history are those in which shelter and support were extended to the victims of tyranny—Great Britain being then blessed with prosperity at home, inspiring awe and reverence abroad, and having her friendship and alliance sedulously courted by the greatest foreign potentates.

That Poland, in an especial manner, claims the gratitude of every Christian community, because, to her prowess alone (under God), it is owing that Christianity and not Mahomedanism is the prevailing religion of Europe.

That the revocation of the edict of Nantes, an act never cited without execration, was productive of far less misery than the partition of Poland, or even than the recent abrogation of the constitutional charter ; and that the dragonings and proscriptions accompanying the former event were measures of lenity compared with the horrible system now in operation for denationalizing Poland ; therefore, that the Huguenots of France in the 17th century—not to mention the royalist refugees from the same country at a later period—had fewer and feebler claims upon our compassion and benevolence than the Polish patriots of the present day.

That the same blessings which have heretofore attended the exercise of our national hospitality may reasonably be expected to attach to any measure for alleviating the sufferings of the Polish refugees, who are animated with a congenial spirit of patriotism and independence with ourselves,—who are, in fact, engaged in the same righteous cause for which Englishmen are ever ready to shed their blood, and who may, ere long, become invaluable to us by their adhesion and alliance ; consequently that, any assistance rendered to them in their necessities, is, even as a point of policy, likely to be counterbalanced by their fidelity to British interests in our own hour of need, and by the subsequent advantages, commercial and political, which must accrue from the reintegration of their country.

That your petitioners deeming the moral example of Great Britain of immense importance, trust that the Parliament of this country will infuse confidence into the minor states of the continent by recognising the claims of the Polish refugees, and resisting those insolent demands of their oppressors which have been made but too successfully to the courts of other nations ; that your petitioners are urgent on this point, in order that England may be exempt from the slightest suspicion of subscribing to the policy of Russia, or of participating in such feelings as would sacrifice our national character to motives unworthy of a high-minded people ? and also, in order that our just indignation may not evaporate into empty words or in a fruitless sympathy for a sacrificed race. That your petitioners conceive that Great Britain, by failing to secure to the faithful Poles the performance of those treaties which it had guaranteed, owes them, at least, some indemnification for their present sufferings ; they believe that Justice and Humanity, gratitude and Religion unite with good Policy in enjoining a compliance with the claims herein set forth ; and they respectfully entreat your hon. House to enable his Majesty, by the exercise of his royal bounty, to grant such pecuniary relief to the Polish exiles landing on our shores, as shall suffice to rescue them from the danger of perishing, until they shall be in a condition to maintain themselves, or until an opportunity be afforded by Providence for retrieving their cause, and redeeming the land of their birth and affections.

## PROCEEDINGS OF TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES, IN FAVOUR OF LEGISLATIVE INQUIRY.

---

WHEN we first announced our intention to move in the House of Commons for a Committee of Inquiry to investigate into the causes of the increased Intemperance among the labouring classes, and to devise legislative measures to prevent its further spread, we were assailed with interjections of surprise, with sneers of ridicule, and all the usual machinery set at work to deter the advocates of improvement from pursuing their course. We had witnessed this so often, however, and overcome it so frequently, that like the cry of "the wolf" it has ceased to produce the least effect; and we therefore maintained our determination unaltered. Besides the exclamations and jests in Parliament, we have had to encounter the buffetings of the press; and the *Courier* in London—the *Scotsman* in Edinburgh—and the *Argus* in Glasgow, have each deprecated the idea of legislative interference. They have denied the fact of intemperance being on the increase; and repudiated the idea of its being more prevalent among the labouring than among the more wealthy classes of society. This is a point which evidence will best decide, and furnishes of itself a strong ground for a Committee of Inquiry. But the fact is so notorious that we cannot comprehend how any one can fail to perceive it in his daily walks, if he ever goes abroad, or his daily readings, if he stays at home. Every newspaper in England contains unhappily too many proofs, in its police and law reports, of the constant association of disease and crime with drunkenness in every stage; while the publications especially devoted to the exposure of the evils of intemperance, of which there is one in London, one in Dublin, one in Preston, and one in Glasgow, and of which there are nearly a hundred in America, abound with instances with which their crowded columns teem in melancholy fulness. But the most convincing evidence of all is to be found in the official reports, which from time to time appear from public institutions; and from one of these we give a short extract, as a sample of the rest, taken from the miscellaneous paragraphs of the *Times* newspaper but a few days ago. It is as follows:—

"GIN DRINKING.—The 76 deaths which have occurred in the year have been, with the exception of those who have died from advanced age, principally caused by the disease of the brain, of the lungs, and the complaints brought on by those deadly potions of ardent spirits in which the lower classes seem more than ever to indulge. In a very great number of the recent cases, both amongst men and women, the insanity is caused entirely by spirit drinking. This may in some measure be attributed to the young not being taught to consider the practice disgraceful, and to their being tempted, by the gorgeous splendour of the present

gin mansions, to begin a habit which they never would have commenced had they been obliged to steal, fearful of being observed, into the obscurity of the former dram-shop.—From the *Report of the Middlesex Lunatic Asylum at Hanwell.*"

This state of things is daily exciting more and more attention, and accordingly we find, both in the House of Lords and the House of Commons, frequent allusion to the evil, and that kind of skirmishing which is called "beating about the bush"—a sort of going round and round a subject, and looking at it as if desiring to touch, but being afraid to grasp it. This will go on augmenting, till at length, public opinion being fully awakened to all its horrors, the country will demand some healing remedy, which must and will be applied.

The Temperance Societies, of which there are now a very large number scattered over the kingdom, embracing among their presidents and directors, some of the most able and distinguished philanthropists of the country, have taken the matter up in good earnest; and we subjoin one of the Circulars which have reached us from Scotland, where the newspapers affected to treat the motion for inquiry with disdain. It is as follows:

*Glasgow, April 16, 1834.*

The Committee of the Scottish Temperance Society annex a copy of a petition, in the course of signature in Glasgow, in favour of Mr. Buckingham's Motion, for a Committee of Inquiry into the causes of National Intemperance, to be brought before the House of Commons on the 20th of May next.

The Committee are very desirous that similar petitions should be sent from all parts of the country. While it is natural for them to look to kindred associations to take the lead and bear the chief part of the burden, they cannot believe that any of their countrymen, excepting the intemperate, the interested, and the indifferent, are so devoid of interest in the well-being of the community, as to withhold the influence of their opinion in a matter so important. They regard the object of Mr. Buckingham's motion, as the first step of a return to sound principle and safe practice, which, if followed up by the Legislature, will bring to light a system of legalized and tolerated evil, of which few of our senators have at present any conception. Such an exhibition held up before the eyes of the nation cannot fail to have a favourable influence upon the cause in which we have embarked; and it is to be hoped, when the extent of national intemperance is ascertained, and its causes pointed out, that the moral energies of our country will be put forth in every practicable way, and our people delivered from all the crime, poverty, and degradation that flow from it.

While they conceive it their duty to embrace every lawful and proper mean of calling the public mind to the consideration of this subject, they trust that no subordinate measure will in the least withdraw attention from the means already in operation. These must be kept up with increased activity, until public opinion become so far enlightened and rectified, as to superinduce and secure a style of legislation in accordance with it; and as by this means alone power and permanency can be given to the efforts of Government, they must on no account slacken in their exertions as the associated friends of temperance, even when they avail themselves of collateral aid in attaining their object.

They are happy to state that several of our representatives in our Parliament have joined our standard and will cheerfully present our petitions, but as an interest in the cause will be more generally diffused by the appointment of your own local members to present them, they would suggest, that they be committed to them, and that they be requested to support the prayer of the petition. As no time is now to be lost, they would recommend, that on receipt of this, you call a meeting of your committee to prepare and forward a petition with the least possible delay.

In name of the Committee,

WILLIAM COLLINS, CHAIRMAN.

Unto the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled. The Petition of the undersigned inhabitants of Glasgow and its vicinity.

**HUMBLY SHOWETH,**

That your Petitioners are deeply affected with the alarming extent to which the vice of drunkenness prevails in our country, and as intemperance is adverse to individual comfort, domestic happiness, national prosperity, and the good moral condition of the community, your Petitioners would humbly, but earnestly, entreat your Honourable House to institute a special enquiry into the extent, influence, and causes, of this great national vice, with the view of adopting such measures as may seem best fitted to diminish the evil.

Your Petitioners would particularly observe, that the numerous evils which originate in, or are intimately associated with, the vice of drunkenness, form a special claim on the attention of every paternal Government, which is desirous of promoting the peace, and happiness, and virtue, of its subjects. Amongst these evils, the fearful increase of crime forms a prominent object of regard. From the concurrent testimony of the Judges and Juries, who, in their investigations into crime, are led to the discovery of its chief exciting causes, and who, on this account, can give the most competent evidence, we have from all quarters of our country, the invariable declaration, that the largest portion of crime originates in Intemperance. The Superintendents of our Police, and Jails, and Bridewells, give the same testimony. And, in short, the Judicial Authorities, of every order, concur in attesting the appalling fact, that at least three-fourths of all the crimes which afflict and disgrace our country, are committed under the immediate influence of intemperance.

Your Petitioners would next advert to the direct and invariable tendency of intemperance to produce poverty and wretchedness among the people. The Overseers of poor-houses, and those who are any way connected with the management of the poor, give it as their unvarying experience, that the largest portion of the pauperism which exists, is occasioned by the prevalence of this debasing vice,—that nothing is found to impoverish individuals and families, and is so destructive of their comfort, independence, and prosperity, as being addicted to drunkenness: and while those who are addicted to this vice entail misery and wretchedness on themselves, they and their families not unfrequently become a burden on the community.

The prevention of disease, and the preservation of the national health, form another subject of regard to every good Government. And on this subject your Petitioners would refer to the numerous Medical Testimonies which have lately been transmitted to each Member of your Honourable House, as furnishing the most unequivocal evidence, that a large portion of the diseases which afflict the people originate in intemperance—that while it aggravates almost every disease, it renders many of them incurable—and that intemperance is the most fruitful source of the numerous and afflicting maladies which prevail in our country.

Your Petitioners might urge many other considerations on the attention of your Honourable House, such as the increasing ignorance and depravity of the young, from the neglect or poverty of drunken parents, the tendency of this vice to corrupt the principles and demoralize the character of the people, its adverse influence on the moral condition of the community, and its sure, though silent operation, in undermining national prosperity; but they feel assured, that those already alluded to, from their obvious and prevalent character, as originating in, or intimately associated with, the wide-spreading vice of drunkenness, are such as loudly call on your Honourable House to examine into the causes of the extensive prevalence of a vice, which forms a fruitful source of crime, disease, poverty, and wretchedness, in our country.

May it therefore please your Honourable House to appoint a Committee to inquire into the causes of the prevailing Drunkenness in our country, and to adopt such means for its Prevention as in your wisdom you may judge best fitted to accomplish such an important object.



The Friends of Temperance in London have not been less active ; and we have reason to know that very extensive circulation has been given to an Address, emanating from individuals whose names are attached to it, calculated to carry great weight with it wherever these names are known, which is in every large town of England at least. After advertg to some discussion that had taken place in the British and Foreign Temperance Society, as to their adopting measures for promoting a Parliamentary Inquiry into the extent and causes of Drunkenness in this empire, the writers say :

Under these circumstances, we feel it to be our duty as friends of Temperance, acting independently of any Temperance Society, to call your immediate attention to the interesting subject of Mr. Buckingham's proposed motion " For a Select Committee of the House of Commons to inquire into the causes of the great increase of habitual drunkenness among the labouring classes of the kingdom, and to devise legislative preventatives against the further spread of this great national evil."

To give efficiency to this motion it is most important that it should be supported by numerous petitions ; and we confidently rely upon your kindness in adopting the following suggestions for procuring a petition from your parish, town, or neighbourhood.

We need scarcely point out the advantages of these petitions being committed to the care of as many members of Parliament as possible, as the duty of presenting them will require each member to make himself acquainted with their contents ; and thus a great object, in the diffusion of information upon the subject in the House, will be secured. We, therefore, strongly recommend that your petition be addressed to the Parliamentary Representative of your place ; but, if you can serve the cause by obtaining more than one petition, care should be taken to divide their presentation among various influential members, avoiding those who would be likely to be engaged in this service by their own constituents.

In addition to a general petition from the inhabitants of your neighbourhood, it would be further highly serviceable if distinct petitions could be procured from every religious congregation and benevolent or scientific institution in your district.

Let us, in addition, urge upon you the advantage of writing yourself, and of procuring any of your friends to write, to your Parliamentary Representatives, pressing upon them to support the motion for a Select Committee of INQUIRY.

Confiding in your immediate attention to this important business, we are, yours faithfully,

Baptist W. Noel, M.A., Minister of St. John's, Bedford-row.

Josiah Pratt, B.D., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman-street, London.

Henry George Watkins, M.A., Rector of St. Swithin, London.

Daniel Wilson, M.A. Vicar of St. Mary, Islington.

J. Pye Smith, D.D., Prof. Div. in the Old Protestant Dissenting College, Homerton.

F. A. Cox, L.L.D., Minister of Mare-street Chapel, Hackney.

John Clayton, Junr., M.A. Minister of the Poultry Chapel.

Wm. Allen, F.R.S., F.R.A.S., F.L.S., &c.

Richard Barrett, Northampton-square

John Palmer Parken, 13 New Boswell Court, Carey-street.

Robert Sears, 53, Paternoster-row, St. Paul's.

The motion has been deferred from Tuesday, the 20th of May, as that is Whitsun Tuesday, on which the House of Commons does not sit : and it is therefore fixed for the following Tuesday, the 27th of May. This will not be an evil, as on the 20th, a great Public Meeting is to be held at Exeter Hall,—the Anniversary of the British and Foreign Temperance Society in London ; and the report of its proceedings having a week to circulate through the country before the Parliamentary discussion comes on, will materially assist it.

## REVIEW OF THE SIX NIGHTS' DEBATE ON THE REPEAL OF THE IRISH UNION.

WE expressed, in our last, the hopelessness of giving even an abridgment of a debate which has now extended over a longer period than any ever remembered in the annals of Parliament, and where the principal speakers seemed to strive with each other for the mastery in the length of their orations. A debate of nearly forty hours' duration, and with speeches of three, four, five, and six hours long, is so unmanageable, that the bare perusal of it is given up in despair. Its very length, therefore, defeats its own purpose. As far as the House of Commons is concerned, all speaking beyond a certain tolerable limit—say two hours at the utmost, for any one person on any one subject, and at any one time—is not merely useless, but injurious to the cause it advocates; as it repulses those whom it aims to persuade, and vexes and irritates those whom it desires to convince: while out of doors the length is still more injurious; for when carried beyond endurable limits, the newspaper is flung aside with despair, and the reader does not even enter upon the perusal of a debate, which he sees from the beginning he never can follow to the end. We venture to affirm, therefore, that no discussion has taken place in Parliament since the Reform Bill was passed, the reports of which were so little read as those of the debate on the Irish Union; since the great majority of men will turn from the interminable columns of the papers that are filled with it, with a feeling of repugnance at its inordinate length, and take refuge in the smaller paragraphs of miscellaneous and more varied matter. We shall endeavour, therefore, to rescue such portions of the more striking parts of the discussion from this oblivion, as appears to us, on a review of the whole, to be most worthy of preservation.

Mr. O'Connell's opening speech was, as we said before, much less effective, in matter and manner, than almost any that we ever remember to have heard him deliver; and we cannot but believe, that he himself, as well as his supporters, felt this to be the case. No one, who is in the habit of witnessing his nightly sallies on general topics, can fail to deny him the just claim to great power of argument, singular acuteness of perception, amazing readiness of reply, and an almost infinite variety of knowledge, and consummate tact in its application. All these qualities are from time to time, evinced by Mr. O'Connell, though not always to the same extent: for he is so unequal, that scarcely any two persons can differ more from each other than does Mr. O'Connell from himself, at particular periods, in each of these respects. The present was one of his least favourable periods; and this, perhaps, appeared the stronger, from the high expectations excited of his coming forth in all his power, on this great and favourite question of the Repeal.

After a short, and broken, and tame introduction, his first attempt was, to prove that England had not acquired a title to the dominion of Ireland by conquest or subjugation, and he went through a long series of historical documents, all interesting to the antiquary and the historian, but utterly out of place in a discussion like the present. Nevertheless, in the reign of James the First, the English, by a long career of crimes and atrocities, possessed themselves of the estates of the Irish, and in 1614, the first period of subjugation had arrived: leaving still, however, an independent Parliament in the country. In 1782, the legislative independence of Ireland was acknowledged, by an Act of the British Parliament; and from that period Ireland had gone on in a career of increased and increasing prosperity. At length came the Union with England, which had been effected by means the most corrupt—by the most shameless bribery, in titles and money, of the Irish Members, and by frauds of the grossest nature, against which some of the most distinguished men then and now existing raised their voices, but in vain. Lord Plunkett, Lord Grey, Mr. Grattan, and many others, were quoted, in support of this assertion:—and up to this part of his speech, Mr. O'Connell's case was completely established.

When he came, however, to the latter and by far the more important part, he was not by any means so successful. He showed that the Union was the principal cause of absenteeism, which of itself was highly injurious to Ireland; but he entirely failed to show that if the Union was repealed, and the domestic legislature restored, the condition of the people could be made better by any measures which he could even suggest as remedies for existing evils. The miseries of the Irish people no one can deny; but the connecting link in the chain, which was requisite to prove that these miseries were a consequence of the Union—and the Union only—and that its repeal would remove them entirely from the land, was not, to our apprehension at least, applied; and this failure was, from the beginning, fatal to Mr. O'Connell's cause.

Mr. Spring Rice opened the debate on the second night, in reply to Mr. O'Connell, who was absent from the House from indisposition, occasioned probably by the length of his speech on the previous evening—five hours and-a-half—augmented, perhaps, by depression of spirits from its unfavourable reception. Mr. Rice first endeavoured to show that in voting for a Committee of Inquiry, since Mr. O'Connell would have the choice of the members of whom it should be composed, the question of Repeal would be considered to be conceded; and the motion had been changed from a declaration against the Union, to the appointment of a Committee, expressly to bind those who might think the latter a perfectly safe proceeding—and he illustrated this point very satisfactorily from Mr. O'Connell's own conduct at the Dungarven election. Mr. Rice said he did not intend to meet the motion by a direct negative, but should propose as an amendment, a series of resolutions for an address to the Crown, declaring the determination of the House to preserve the Legislative Union inviolate. Mr. Rice then replied to the historical parts of Mr. O'Connell's speech, and showed that they were wholly beside the question now under discussion. He proved also the great profligacy of the Irish Parliament while it did exist—compared with which, our own Boroughmongering House

seemed purity itself. In enumerating the benefits which Ireland had received from the Union with England—and this was undoubtedly the most, if not the only important part of the question—he showed that a great number of substantial reforms of old and crying abuses had really taken place; and proved that Ireland was exempted from many of the fiscal burdens of England, besides being assisted by grants of money for public works, institutions, &c., to the extent of nearly ten millions sterling; that its agricultural wealth had greatly increased, and that its manufactures were more flourishing now than at any former period. Mr. Rice concluded a very long and able speech, which lasted six hours and a half, amidst cheers from all parts of the House, which continued for several minutes, and stated the substance of the amendment he intended to propose—the paper on which it had been written having been left at the Treasury, or lost in the removal—as on searching for it diligently no trace of it could be found.

Mr. Emerson Tennant opened the third day's debate by seconding the amendment of Mr. Rice for an Address to the Crown, pledging the House to preserve the Union inviolate. Mr. Tennant spoke for about three hours, and his speech was both agreeable in manner and excellent in matter, with the exception of some violent, unnecessary, and unjust attacks upon the Catholics of Ireland. But after the five hours' speech of Mr. O'Connell, and the six hours' speech of Mr. Rice, the attention of the House was very difficult to secure, and therefore the noise of persons coming in and going out, and the buzz of conversation between those who remained in the House, prevailed during nearly the whole of the period; though had not Mr. Rice gone over much of the same ground before him, Mr. Tennant would have been listened to with much greater attention—as his speech really deserved. It was quite as documentary, more argumentative, and much more eloquent in many passages than Mr. Rice's; but it came as a twice-told tale, and therefore failed to make the impression which it would undoubtedly have done if it had had precedence in point of time, and all the charms of freshness and originality. At the end of Mr. Tennant's speech, the Address of Mr. Rice, which had by this time been recovered, and which Mr. Tennant had seconded, was then read by the Speaker as follows:

We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons in Parliament assembled, feel it our duty humbly to approach your Majesty's throne, to record, in the most solemn manner, our fixed determination to maintain, unimpaired and undisturbed, the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, which we consider to be essential to the strength and stability of the empire, to the continuance of the connexion between the two countries, and to the peace, and security, and happiness of all classes of your Majesty's subjects. We feel this our determination to be as much justified by our views of the general interests of the state, as by our conviction that to no other portion of your Majesty's subjects is the maintenance of the Legislative Union more important than to the inhabitants of Ireland themselves. We humbly represent to your Majesty that the Imperial Parliament have taken the affairs of Ireland into their most serious consideration, and that various salutary laws have been enacted since the Union, for the advancement of the most important interests of Ireland, and of the empire at large. In expressing to your Majesty our resolution to maintain the Legislative Union inviolate, we humbly beg leave to assure your Majesty that we shall persevere in applying our best attention to the removal of all just causes of complaint, and to the promotion of all well-considered measures of improvement.

Mr. Feargus O'Connor followed Mr. Emerson Tennant, and warmly

defended his friend, Mr. O'Connell, from the aspersions thrown out against him as the hired or paid agent of those whose cause he advocated. He said the payment was perfectly voluntary, and one of which no man need be ashamed. He added that Grattan, Horne Tooke, and Fox, had all been remunerated for their public services, and no one thought them dishonoured by so doing. He repudiated the idea of Catholic ascendancy following the Repeal of the Union—avowed himself to be a Protestant, and said he would resist any attempt at ascendancy to the utmost. Mr. O'Connor was often interrupted, and spoke amidst the same confused noise that prevailed during Mr. Tennant's speech; from which it was very difficult to hear either of them continuously in the body of the House; though the reporters, seated against the wainscot partition of the back row in the gallery—hearing much more distinctly—were enabled to give very full reports of their speeches.

Mr. Littleton succeeded Mr. O'Connor: and his official situation as Secretary for Ireland giving him great weight, and his estimable personal character causing him to be equally respected on both sides of the House, he obtained a ready hearing, and spoke with great effect. As we never remember Mr. O'Connell to have been so feeble, so we never remember Mr. Littleton to have been so strong. They seemed for this debate to have changed places. The line taken by Mr. Littleton, was somewhat different from either of the preceding speakers. He adverted to the state of things marked out by the Repealers, should their wishes be accomplished. A tax of 75 per cent. was to be imposed on the income of all absentees; and men having estates in Ireland, were not to be allowed to have any in any other country. He quoted several passages from speeches delivered by Mr. O'Connell, in Ireland, which made a great impression; in one of which, Mr. O'Connell said, that as to legislators sitting in London, there was no getting at them; but if the Parliaments at in Dublin, and did not do rightly, the electors might take their short sticks in their hands some fine morning, and go up to their representatives, and compel them to vote honestly and rightly. Mr. Littleton showed also, that if an Irish Parliament should become exclusively Irish in its feelings, and its interests, an English Parliament might become exclusively British; and thus, in the conflict, the weakest would receive the greatest injury. He did not deny that Mr. O'Connell had, up to the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill, been of great service to his country; but since that period, he had done great mischief. He hoped, however, that after the solemn settlement of this question of the Repeal, by the vote which he doubted not would be given upon it, Mr. O'Connell would feel it to be both his duty and his interest to let the question rest, and permit his distracted country to enjoy some repose.

Mr. Barron rose at the close of Mr. Littleton's speech: but the Members began gradually to drop off, as if tired of the apparently interminable subject. Mr. Barron persevered, however, and spoke for upwards of an hour; but amidst so much noise, that though we sat within a short distance of the speaker, we could scarcely hear one perfect sentence throughout. He had not originally been a Repealer; but seeing the desertion of the country by its nobility and gentry, consequent upon the Union, and believing that nothing but a domestic legislature would bring them back, and that their continued absence

would drain off the whole wealth of the land, to be spent in foreign countries, he had become a Repealer from conviction; though he would rather, had it been possible, that Ireland should have enjoyed all the benefits which the Union promised her, but which, unhappily, she had never yet realized.

Mr. Ruthven opened the fourth night's discussion on Friday evening, he having moved the adjournment of the debate on the previous night. Mr. Ruthven is, at any time, a heavy and uninteresting speaker, and though the interest he felt in this question gave him more than usual animation, his speech produced but little effect. He went over much of the ground previously occupied by Mr. O'Connell. He quoted a sentence of Charles James Fox, who said, "That the Union was vicious in principle, abominable in its means, and a measure the most disgraceful ever carried or proposed." He said the word "Repeal" was so popular in Ireland, that not only was it uttered by men and women, in every class, but that even children were taught to lisp it in their infancy. He met the assertion of the profligacy of the Irish Parliament, with an assertion of the equal profligacy of the English Parliament at the same period; and showed that while titles and honours were the bribes for Irishmen, the English Members were paid by Sir Robert Walpole in hard cash—one man having constantly received 500*l.* for his session, and speaking and voting accordingly. He disputed Mr. Rice's statements of the improved condition of Ireland since the Union, and said, that before the Union there were 40,000 able men receiving 40*s.* a week in Limerick; and that at present there were only 10,000 men receiving 10*s.* a week, while there were 50,000 men in Dublin subsisting on casual charity from absolute incapacity to obtain employment.

Sir Daniel Sandford, the Greek Professor of Glasgow, and new Member for Paisley, who had but a few days taken his seat, made his maiden speech on this occasion; and being a new Member and an eloquent speaker, made a very favourable impression. Sir Daniel contended that Mr. O'Connell had not made out his case; and that his arguments were more like those of a special pleader than of a statesman. He said that absenteeism had been caused by increased luxury and the appetite for foreign travel, and not by the Union—he said Scotland was tranquil and flourishing, because it had no agitators or men who traded in agitation, though Scotland had not had an equal measure of justice dealt out to her by the Reform Act, as had been done to Ireland, in the number of her representatives.

Mr. Henry Grattan followed, and in an animated and indignant strain, dwelt upon the wrongs done to Ireland—denounced the Coercion Bill—and analyzed Mr. Rice's financial statement. He said the people of Ireland consented to the Union with England, on condition of receiving relief from many of their grievances, and tithes among the rest, though that hated impost was still collected at the point of the bayonet. He was resolved, therefore, to oppose the further endurance of a measure which gave no satisfaction to Ireland, and produced no benefit to England.

Mr. Lambert made a long and emphatic speech, which was principally directed to an exposition of Mr. O'Connell's conduct in Ireland, as contrasted with his speeches in the House of Commons. For this

purpose Mr. Lambert quoted largely from speeches delivered by Mr. O'Connell on various occasions in Ireland, some of which were very exciting and inflammatory, and calculated undoubtedly to rouse the hearers to a pitch of frenzy. He adverted also to the tribute or rent collected for Mr. O'Connell at the Catholic chapels, and introduced a passage from a letter of the right reverend Dr. Murray, condemning the manner in which that tribute was collected; though Mr. Lambert said he approved entirely of the first Catholic rent raised to carry on the great work of Catholic Emancipation, and of an appropriation of a part of that fund to reward Mr. O'Connell's undoubted services in that cause, but the present mode of raising the tribute, and its present application, he condemned in the strongest terms. Mr. Lambert also complained of the vituperation which Mr. Emerson Tennant had bestowed on the Catholics on account of their religion, as he hoped that the day for such intolerance had gone by.

Mr. Sheil spoke next, and began by alluding to the altered tone of Mr. Lambert, who, being a Catholic, had once said in that House, that if justice were not done to Ireland in the relief of the Catholics from the payment of tithes to support a Protestant church—all Catholics in Ireland would become Repealers. Justice had *not* been done to Ireland in this particular, and yet Mr. Lambert opposed Repeal. He next adverted to the imputation on Mr. O'Connell for receiving the tribute paid him by the Catholic people.

Mr. Lambert, he said, had adverted to the O'Connell tribute; but let him place that tribute in one scale, and his own liberty as an emancipated Catholic, attained by the exertions of the Liberator in the other, and determine which preponderated. Mr. Lambert himself confessed the eminent and important services of the hon. member for Dublin. Was there any man who would venture to deny them? And were those services, and the sacrifices by which they were accompanied, to go without their reward? Was the relinquishment of a profession, attended with immense emolument, nothing? For nearly forty years of unceasing toil had Mr. O'Connell struggled for the freedom of his country; he had visited London, session after session, in the pursuit of that object; and at length, when it was carried, his country called on him constantly to attend heretofore. Under such circumstances, the tribute was no more than the payment of a debt, incurred by vast sacrifices and most important services. Mr. Grattan received 50,000*l.* for his services. What did he do? He gave Ireland that Parliament which had been so much an object of censure and derision. Wherefore should not Ireland now make a corresponding return for the attempt made to give her a better legislature?

As one of the great changes effected by the Union, he quoted from a Report of the House of Commons, of which Mr. Thomas Spring Rice was himself chairman, the following remarkable fact—That “Prior to the Union there were 98 peers; besides many gentlemen of high rank and fortune, residing in Dublin; and now there are only 42.” This was the case when that report was presented, at present he was sorry to say that the 12 had been reduced to 2.

Mr. Sheil, after much able dissertation on the historical part of the subject in debate, adverted to the present state of Ireland, and to the contrariety of the views entertained on the subject by Mr. Rice when he was out of office—and the same Mr. Rice when in place.

He said the right hon. secretary, following in the track of his hon. friend, the member for Belfast, had vaunted loudly of the prosperity of Ireland. The prosperity of Ireland!—where was it? Oh that the right hon. gentleman could stand upon the quay at Limerick, and see the numerous vessels which daily sailed from

it filled with the produce of the soil of Ireland, whilst her inhabitants were perishing from famine and disease, and pestilence! Sure he was, that if the right hon. gentleman cast his eyes on the one side upon the rich freightage which was departing from Ireland, and on the other to the endless variety of suffering to which her population was exposed in her cottages and larger houses, he would never again talk about her prosperity and happiness. Prosperity and happiness! If he asked where it was to be found in Ireland, the echoes of her mountains would answer, where? The fact was, and he admitted it with pain and humiliation, that the population of Ireland was in a worse condition than the basest boors in any other country in Europe. They were worse housed, they were worse covered, and they were worse fed. They were cooped up in dwellings to which swine would scarcely be admitted in any other country in Europe. They were covered with rags which beggars would scorn to wear in this country; and, with the sweat of their brow, in the agony of their hearts, they reaped the harvests which they were not permitted to taste.

The people of England knew that at the time when the cries of Irish distress, wafted across the Channel, struck the ears, and, to their honour be it spoken, reached the hearts of Englishmen, the granaries of Ireland were absolutely bursting with the plenty which they contained. That in any country would have been calamitous; but it was doubly calamitous when it occurred in a country which was blest with fertility by Providence almost beyond every other, but which was withered into sterility by the infernal policy of man, even if it were not entirely destroyed by it. An hon. gentleman had told him that Ireland was prosperous, and had at the same time offered him a system of poor laws as a boon for her working classes. But would the Secretary for the Treasury consent to the introduction of poor laws into Ireland? Oh, no. On the banks of the Thames he took a profound view of the Repeal of the Union; and on the banks of the Shannon a shallow view of the necessity of poor-laws for Ireland. From his desk at the Treasury he cast a confused glance upon the consequences of Repealing the Union; from his seat at Mount Trenchard he cast a philosophic eye upon the mischief of the poor-laws. Once the hon. gentleman was, in the barbarous Latin of other days, *Hibernia hibernior*; now he had reversed his nature, as if the ablutions of the Cam had made him forget the aspersions of the Shannon. Whilst the hon. gentleman occupied a seat on his (Mr. Sheil's) side of the house, no one could speak with greater indignation of the wrongs and grievances of Ireland; not even his education at an English University had made him forget his sympathy for Ireland, but it sometimes happened that a change of locality made a complete change in our views; objects were seen in different colours when the light in which, and the place from which, they were seen, were altered, and hence it happened—at least so he conjectured—that when the education of the University was crowned by the representation of the town of Cambridge, the hon. gentleman who had seen every thing before in colours of gloom, saw every thing afterwards in colours of rose.

Until November, 1830, when the hon. secretary first began to see political objects in a new point of view, he had always refused to join in any address which spoke of the salutary measures either designed or adopted for Ireland by his Majesty's Government. But the hon. Secretary to the Treasury had referred to speeches which had been made upon this subject. He (Mr. Sheil) would refer to some expressions of the hon. gentleman, and would ask whether, in the annals of eloquence, there could be any thing so opposite as his sentiments now and at a previous time? In the speech of Mr. Spring Rice on the 22d of April, 1822, on the motion of Sir John Newport, there appeared this passage:—"What was the first tribute which the Imperial Parliament of 1801 tendered to Ireland, in their first notice of the situation of that country after the Union? Their first statute was the Irish Martial Law Bill." (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman was then upon the *pavé*; but he forgot now what he had formerly recollected; but he said in 1822 that the renewal of martial law in 1801 was the first step adopted by the Imperial Parliament respecting Ireland. He continued to say the spirit of the British Legislature towards Ireland had been in accordance with the principle upon which that act was founded. "In tracing the history of



Irish legislation," said Mr. Spring Rice, "both before and since the Union, there appeared, as it were, two streams passing through the channel of Parliament. In one flowed acts of strenuous finance, or equally strong coercion—the one with great malice, the other with great power. In the other channel the struggle was made, but in vain, to procure an examination into the state and condition of the people, in the hope of discovering and applying some remedy for their evils.' Would the hon. gentleman give them now a committee for that purpose? "It was curious," he continued, "in tracing these proceedings, to observe with what a singularly felicitous uniformity the channel of coercion always flowed, and that of inquiry was always resisted and impeded." (Prolonged cheering.) The house heard this, and now had heard the sentiments of the hon. gentleman in 1834. See how the political atmosphere had cleared; and now the clouds which had rested upon Ireland had fled, or were converted into gorgeousness and gold. He (Mr. Sheil) could not, however, reconcile the present sentiments of the hon. gentleman with the facts.

Mr. Sheil next adverted to the speech of Sir Daniel Sandford, and said :

The hon. member for Paisley had spoken of the Scottish Union. Was that Union the same as the Irish? Did it establish episcopacy, raising a pontificate on a Calvinistic crew? If England had made an attempt to carry such a scheme of union into effect in Scotland, what would have been the consequence? The house knew that Scotland would have risen almost to a man, and after deluging the country with blood, if England should have succeeded in building her altars there, Scotland would have been left in the situation of a desert. What had been the principle of the past government of Ireland? That principle was expressed by the fact, that while they had 7,000,000 on the one side, and 500,000 on the other, they had a church with enormous revenues, supported for the minority by the moneys of the majority of the people. He wanted them to adopt a system entirely different from that—he wanted them to adopt a system that would combine justice with safety—he wanted them to make Ireland what it ought to be, an independent portion of the British empire. Did they imagine that by adopting the course which the hon. gentleman opposite had recommended to them that they would stifle the demands of Ireland on this subject, or that they would prevent that collision which the refusal of those demands might hereafter create? They knew very well that the resolution proposed by the hon. gentleman would not stop the agitation on this question in Ireland. The Reform Bill had given the people of Ireland a franchise which they could not now take from them, and they would exercise that franchise in sending representatives to that house who would insist on a Repeal of the Union. If the Government and Parliament of England should be deaf to every admonition, they might depend upon it that in the lapse of a few years the Protestants of Ireland would fall in with the immense mass of their countrymen in calling for this measure, and how could they resist such a call as that? He spoke with sincerity on this subject; he had no motives to induce him to exaggerate the dangers of the case. He spoke to them not in the language of threat, but of admonition—of warning. He would tell them that the mass of the people of Ireland would form such an association as they would not be able to resist, and that then, if England should happen to go to war with France, whose friendship might be as unstable as his dynasty, that then they might have reason to wish that there existed an independent Legislature in Ireland. (Loud cheers.)

Sir Robert Peel rose to follow Mr. Sheil: and it being then long past midnight, there were loud cries of "Adjourn;" but Sir Robert, having at all times the ear of the House, determined to proceed. As Mr. Sheil's was decidedly one of the best speeches yet delivered on the Repeal side, so Sir Robert Peel's was the most lively and entertaining, at least, on the Union side: and in justice to the argument, and for the fairness of balancing the strength of each side in the debate, we make two quotations from his speech. The first is, when in adverting to Mr. Sheil's prediction, he said:

I certainly did hope that the hon. and learned gentleman who has this night exhibited himself in the character of a prophet would have seen the propriety of redeeming the implied stipulation which he amongst others gave at no very distant period. In the year 1825, after so many years of misgovernment, of which the hon. and learned gentleman has to-night given us such a fearful record—in the year 1825, I say, that hon. and learned gentleman was himself examined as a valuable witness, and gave evidence upon the subject of Catholic disabilities and a repeal of the Union. Upon that occasion the following question was put to him:—"Do you think, in case the general question of Catholic emancipation were settled by Parliament, there would be a power existing in any individual to get public assemblies together, and to create a combined operation in Ireland?" His reply, the reply of Mr. Sheil, was as follows:—"I am convinced that it would not be in the power of any individual, no matter how great his influence might be, nor no matter how perverse his ambition might be, to draw large convocations of men together in Ireland; nothing but the sense of individual injury produces these great and systematic gatherings, through the medium of which so much inflammatory matter is conveyed through the country." (Great cheering.) But the hon. and learned gentleman did not stop here. He did not content himself with this simple and satisfactory answer to the question put to him; so impressed was he with the necessity of establishing the fact that the people of Ireland would be perfectly contented with the removal of their political disabilities, that he proceeded in his reply to volunteer the following statement on the subject of the Repeal of the Union:—"Let me take the question of the Union for example; there are many who suppose that if the Catholic question were to be satisfactorily arranged the merits of the Union would be discussed. But I am convinced that if the Catholic question were settled, a great body of the population, so far from being dissatisfied, would be perfectly contented with the Union, or be indifferent to it. Whenever any mention is made in a Roman Catholic assembly of the evils of that measure, it is made for the purpose of rhetorical excitement (immense cheers), and not with any serious view upon the part of the speaker to distrust that, which in my humble judgment is perfectly indissoluble. (Loud and repeated cheers.) In answer to the question I beg to add this, that I am perfectly convinced that neither upon tithes nor the Union, nor any other political subject, could the people of Ireland be powerfully and permanently excited." (Hear.) Then I turn round upon the hon. and learned member who has given this evidence, and I ask him, why not vote for the present resolution? (Loud cheers.) Where are your objections, I would say to him, to the principle of that resolution, a principle which you so strenuously maintained in 1825? (Cheers.) How comes it that you hold us to be wrong now for asserting the opinion that you yourself asserted then? You were then, in 1825, an excluded Catholic, suffering under what you considered an injustice, and even then you declared that the British empire should not be dismembered, for that the Union was perfectly indissoluble. (Loud cheering.) What events have occurred since 1825 to justify your retraction of the opinion that you then expressed? Since that period the Catholic disabilities have been removed, and at the present moment there are 30 Catholic representatives speaking within these walls the sense of the Roman Catholic people of Ireland. If the Union, according to the hon. and learned gentleman in 1825, was indissoluble, surely it is still more so now, when upon the broad principles of justice the disabilities affecting the Roman Catholics of Ireland have been altogether removed.

The second quotation that we shall make (and it will be the last), is from that part of Sir Robert's speech, in which, with all the art of a most practised actor, he excited the merriment of the House by the following dramatic scene:

He knew not whether in the contemplated restoration of Irish rights it was also • designed to revert to the legitimate succession of the ancient monarchs of Ireland. ("Hear," and a laugh.) He disclaimed all interference on this point, but if he might express an opinion, and if the ancient monarchs of Ireland were restored to administer the functions of the empire, he knew no one better entitled to resume that station than the hon. and learned member behind him, Mr. Fergus

O'Connor. ("Hear," and a laugh.) He had found that an ancient historian had thus described a circumstance to which he would advert, disclaiming at the same time any wish to prejudice the claim of any other person who might present himself as preferable to the hon. and learned member for Cork for the honour of embodying and representing the ancient kings of Ireland :—"Dermot Macmurrough, King of Leinster, halt and lecherous, vowed dishonestly to serve his lust on the beautiful Queen of Meath, and in the absence of her husband allured the woman so far, that she condescended to be stolen away. This dishonourable wrong to avenge, O'Rorick, the King, her husband, besought assistance of Roderick or Roger O'Connor, King of Connaught, at that time general Monarch of all Ireland." From this it would appear that there were two other kings. He knew not whether their descendants might prefer their claim. If they should do so, however, he (Sir R. Peel) would not say that the hon. and learned gentleman would be long in repealing the union between their respective districts. (Hear, hear.) But perhaps the hon. and learned gentleman might, on the claims of Dermot Macmurrough being preferred, be allowed to move for the appointment of a select committee "to inquire and report on the means by which a dissolution of the connexion between the kingdoms of Leinster and Munster, was effected, on the effect of that dissolution upon Munster, and upon the labourers in husbandry and operatives in manufactures in Leinster. (Cheers and laughter.) The historian went on to describe also the customs and ceremonies prescribed at the coronation of these monarchs :—"They thus used to crown their King. A white cow was brought forth which the King must kill, and seeth in water whole, and bathe himself therein stark naked; then sitting in the same caldron, his people about him, he must eat the flesh and drink the broth wherein he sitteth, without cup or dish or use of his hand." So much for their old customs." (Cheers and much laughter.)

Mr. Callaghan, on Monday, opened the fifth night's debate, and advocated the views of Mr. O'Connell. He commented on many parts of Mr. Rice's speech; but did not adduce any thing very new or very striking.

Mr. Serjeant Perrin spoke in opposition to the motion of Mr. O'Connell, and said he should vote for the amendment of Mr. Rice, but chiefly with a view to pledge the House to future measures of relief for Ireland, as he admitted that hitherto justice had not been done to her by this country.

Mr. Finn advocated the Repeal of the Union on the ground that it had caused great evil in Ireland, by crippling it in various ways. He read statements from former speeches of Mr. Rice, when he was in Opposition, and sat as an Irish Member for Limerick, when he admitted that there was music to his ears in the tune of "Garry Owen;" but now, being seated on the Treasury benches, the air of "Oh, the Roast Beef of Old England!" was more melodious and agreeable.

The O'Connor Dorf supported the motion of Mr. O'Connell, though he came into the House perfectly unfettered on the great question of the Repeal of the Union. He denounced the conduct of Mr. Emerson Tennent in imputing personal objects, and impugning the motives of those who were not his inferiors by nature, and thanks to British justice in granting Catholic emancipation, were now his equals in that House. He said that when it suited the purposes of the day, Ireland was made to appear in a condition of the highest prosperity; and when another purpose was to be served, her distress was equally demonstrated.

Sir Robert Bateson contended that the Repeal of the Union was not desired by the people of the North of Ireland, only one person of influence or respectability in all Ulster having yet declared for it—

namely, Mr. Sharman Crawford, the rival candidate of Mr. Emerson Tennant at Belfast, though of late he thought the number might have increased.

Mr. Lefroy said he should support the amendment of Mr. Rice, because he considered the safety of the Established Church in Ireland, and the preservation of property depended in continuing the Legislative Union. He admitted that a great numerical majority of the Catholics were favourable to repeal, but that the Protestants were almost wholly opposed to it.

Mr. R. C. Fergusson complimented Mr. O'Connell on his long and able speech, but said a great part of it went to establish propositions which no one disputed. He admitted all the tyranny of former times, and the bribery that brought about the Union. But bribery was also used in effecting the Union with Scotland. A list of bribes in 1711 had been published, from 1100*l.* to the Earl of Marchmont, down to 11*l.* 5*s.* to other persons, as the purchase-money for votes. But the Union, though corruptly brought about, had been productive of great good to Scotland and England; and so had the Union with Ireland. He should, therefore, for the sake of the Irish people, oppose all attempts to disturb it.

Mr. Ronayne said that the parallel between Scotland and Ireland was not just; because in Scotland there were not, as there were in Ireland, 7,500,000 persons of one religion, made to support the dominant church of the remaining 500,000. He condemned the conduct of the honourable Member for Belfast, Mr. Emerson Tennant, who, he said, though now the advocate of all the abuses of British rule in Ireland, had but recently, in a speech made in that country, held up the American Washington as an example to all Irishmen, and spoken in the severest terms of the pampered prelacy and overgrown Church Establishment of England. He read portions of a letter from the Marquis of Anglesea, addressed to his colleagues on the 9th of October, 1832, and dated from Phoenix Park, Dublin, in which the noble Marquis spoke in strong terms of the necessity of ruling Ireland with more justice and liberality. He condemned the exaction of tithes as the grossest robbery; and said that the people of Ireland would never submit to be thus ground to the dust and treated as

Moslem slaves,

While Heaven has light, or Earth has graves.

Colonel Torrens was opposed to a Repeal of the Union. He did not think absenteeism was at all a cause of injury to Ireland, and even were it so he did not think a Repeal of the Union would cure that evil.

Sir Hussey Vivian said that the interests of Ireland and England were inseparable. He acknowledged, however, the truth of the picture drawn by those who described the condition of the Irish people as most wretched. He had himself passed through the hovels of the people, and he was free to admit that there was no people on the face of the earth who were so wretchedly poor, but he did not attribute this to the Union. He thought that the penalty of a *præmunire* on goods and chattels should attach to the man who might after this period dare to propose a Repeal of the Union.

Dr. Baldwin spoke with great earnestness in support of Mr. O'Con-

nell's motion; and said that the Irish nation were determined to have justice done them; and if force were applied, as suggested by the last speaker, to suppress their demands for it, he would say that resistance would then become a duty.

Mr. Pryme concluded the fifth night's debate, by expressing his determination to oppose a Repeal of the Union, as injurious to both countries.

Mr. Mullins opened the sixth night's debate, on Tuesday, and advocated the Repeal of the Union. He analyzed many parts of Mr. Rice's speech, and compared it with former statements made by the right hon. gentleman, which were greatly at variance the one with the other.

Mr. Jephson disclaimed any idea of being favourable to the Repeal of the Union; but he deprecated in the strongest terms the speech of Mr. Emerson Tennant, the Member for Belfast, as calculated to incense the Catholics against the Protestants, and to make the question of the Union a religious instead of a political topic of discussion.

Mr. Maurice O'Connell supported the original motion; and in answer to the statements of Mr. Rice, respecting the flourishing state of Dublin, showed from various documents, that the trade and population of that city were both greatly on the decay.

Mr. Peter opposed the motion in a strain of very common-place observation, uttered in the most common-place manner. He was listened to, however, with great patience, as the House was very thin—not more than one hundred Members being present, and many of these (about seven o'clock), fast asleep..

Mr. Christmas rallied the attention a little<sup>4</sup> by a more animated strain, and something more of argument; but even he could scarcely retain the ear of the House for more than a few minutes at a time. He was opposed to the Repeal of the Union.

Colonel Verner was opposed to any separation of the two countries, or the establishment of an Irish Parliament. He complained that the Government had been already too liberal to the Catholics, and had neglected the Protestants of Ireland. He said that all the latter regarded the Repeal of the Union as the restoration of Popery, and the restitution of the forfeited estates; and they were therefore wholly opposed to it.

Mr. Hume said, that if the words of Mr. O'Connell's motion—which contained no allusion to a Repeal of the Union, but merely asked a Committee of Inquiry to consider the effects which that measure had produced—had not been accompanied by Mr. O'Connell's speech, he should certainly have voted for it, because he could see no danger in the inquiry. But after the interpretation given by Mr. O'Connell himself to the object of his motion, he should feel bound to vote against it. At the same time he was not prepared to support the amendment of Mr. Rice, because that seemed to assert that Ireland had been sufficiently attended to, and her interests properly protected, by the Imperial Parliament, which he denied. As, therefore, he could not support either the original motion for a Committee, or the Address to the Crown proposed as a substitute, he should submit, at the proper time, the following amendment:

"That the present state of Ireland is afflicting to its inhabitants and dangerous to the well-being of the United Kingdom; and although some salutary laws affecting the Irish people have been passed by the Imperial Parliament, yet we deeply regret that the beneficial results anticipated from the Legislative Union have not been realized. The failure may, however, be attributed to the error of Parliament in refusing or delaying the redress of substantial grievances, and not applying more extensively those remedial measures, chiefly as regards the Established Church of Ireland, which a liberal and benignant policy would dictate. That we will now direct our best and earliest attention to the removal of all existing causes of just complaint, and to the application of such measures of improvement and reform, both in Church and State, as, by doing justice, will best promote the peace and contentment of the people of Ireland; and by thus securing them the full benefit of the British Constitution, increase their attachment to its principles, and give additional strength and prosperity to the Empire."

Lord Althorp followed Mr. Hume, and after commenting on several of the speeches delivered in opposition to Mr. Rice's amendment, said that he did not conceive that amendment to imply that all had been done for Ireland which ought to have been done; though it would not be denied that much had been done, and still more was in progress. And the length of the present discussion, extending over an unprecedented space of time—and heard with the most exemplary patience—was a proof that there was no indisposition on the part of the House to listen to Irish grievances, as he was sure there was no indisposition on the part of the Government to relieve them.

Mr. Lalor rose after this, but as Lord Althorp's speech was considered to be the conclusion of the debate, the cries were loud and incessant for Mr. O'Connell. It was also near eleven o'clock, and as his reply would be expected to take up some time, the House began to grow impatient to come to a division. Scarcely a word, therefore, of Mr. Lalor's speech could be heard.

Mr. E. S. Ruthven met a similar fate, and though he strained hard to be heard, it was difficult to catch a perfect sentence.

Mr. Walker was somewhat more fortunate. Like the two preceding gentlemen he was a decided Repealer, and had been so ever since he had thought of politics, seeing every year a decline in the prosperity of Ireland, and attributing that chiefly to absenteeism, which was the consequence of the Union.

Mr. F. Shaw was opposed to the question of Repeal, and complained, with Colonel Verner, of the too great concessions already made to the Catholics, and the neglect of the Protestants in Ireland. He was quite as much interrupted as either of the preceding speakers.

Mr. W. Roche spoke for some time in support of Mr. O'Connell's motion; but the coughing, cries, clamours, and confusion were so great, that though we sat within ten or twelve feet from the speaker, we could not only not hear a perfect sentence, but could not distinguish even a single word of all that he uttered.

Mr. James next rose, and was assailed with volleys of uproar, but raising his voice to the utmost pitch, he somewhat allayed the ferment, by saying, though others had been allowed to speak for six hours, he would be content with less than six minutes. The whole scene, however, is tolerably well reported in the following paragraph:—

Mr. O'CONNELL and Mr. JAMES rose together, but the former gave way when he saw Mr. James on his legs. The calls for Mr. O'Connell were, however, incessant for some moments.

Mr. JAMES at last made himself heard. Other gentlemen had spoken for six hours each : he would promise them not to speak more than for as many minutes. He should not have obtruded himself at that late period of the debate on the attention of the house, had it not been that immediately before its commencement he had presented a petition from a numerous body of his constituents, praying for a Repeal of the Union. He took that opportunity of stating that he had not then made up his mind upon that subject. He had now come to a fixed determination upon the point. (Hear, hear.) He had listened to most of the speeches which had been delivered on the question ; those which he had not heard himself he had taken the trouble to read (a laugh), and this he must now say, that not the powerful speech of the hon. Secretary of the Treasury,—not the eloquent speech of the hon. member for Belfast,—not the able speech of the right hon. member for Staffordshire,—not even the brilliant speech of the right hon. member for Tamworth, had convinced him of the necessity of continuing the legislative Union between the two countries. (Immense cheering from the Repeal members.) No—they had not convinced him of the necessity of continuing the Union (repeated cheers from the same quarter), for he had been previously convinced (shouts of laughter, and volleys of “hear” from all parts of the house but the repeal corners where there were symptoms of evident discomfiture)—yes, he had been previously convinced, not only of the necessity of continuing the Union, but also of the necessity of cementing it more closely than ever, by the opening speech of the hon. and learned member for Dublin. (Bursts of laughter and cheers for some minutes.) He had never heard counsel argue a bad case with more difficulty than the hon. and learned member had argued this case. (Laughter.) He had utterly and signally failed (hear, hear) in his speech ; he had utterly and signally failed in showing that prosperity would return to Ireland if the Union were repealed, but he had not even made out a *prima facie* case that such a measure would be either just, politic, or expedient. (Great cheering.) The question was now reduced to this narrow compass, “Union or no Union ?” (Hear, hear.) Differing, as he did, from a large body of his constituents, he could not, as an honest man, do otherwise than give his cordial support to His Majesty’s Government, upon this question. (Cheers, and cries of “Question.”)

Mr. O’Dwyer next rose to address the House, but the noise and clamour increasing, he was very short. He supported Mr. O’Connell’s motion. He protested against the imputation of desiring separation under the name of repeal ; and he told Mr. Shaw that he had no pretensions to set himself up as the representative of the aristocracy of Protestantism in Ireland, for that the Repealers contained men of as noble birth, as large possessions, and as long a line of ancestry as himself.

Mr. O’Reilly succeeded, and spoke for a very short time, opposing Repeal, and expressing a hope that the Legislative Union between the two countries would long continue undisturbed.

Mr. O’Connell at length rose to reply. It was now past eleven o’clock ; and the House had become full almost to suffocation. There could scarcely have been less than 600 members present ; so that every part of the House was crammed, including the side galleries and all ; the open space at the bar was completely covered, and the floor of the House, half way up to the table, was filled with Members standing. There was a deep silence restored when Mr. O’Connell began ; and it was maintained throughout the whole of his speech, which lasted about an hour and a quarter. He began it in a firm and spirited manner, altogether different from the tameness of his opening address : and the speech of to-night was as superior to that of the Tuesday preceding, as any one thing could well be to another. He defended the line of conduct he had pursued. He admitted that he was now the

paid servant of the people of Ireland, as the King's Ministers were the paid servants of their royal master. But he had previously given twenty-five years of gratuitous labour to their service; and by the abandonment of a lucrative profession to attend his duties here, he felt that he was as fairly entitled to his reward as any other person giving their services for their remuneration. If the autocrat of Russia employed a gentleman as ambassador or advocate, the extent of his salary would be deemed a proof of the high honour and estimation in which he was held; and he did not see that the voluntary payment of a reward for labour done and service rendered, when it came from the people, was at all less honourable or less fit to be received. It had been said by Sir Daniel Sandford, the Member for Paisley, that Ireland had received better treatment than Scotland, in the case of the Reform Bill. Mr. O'Connell would state the facts, and leave the House to judge. They were these: that Scotland, with 3,000,000 of inhabitants, and 45 representatives, had 8 additional members given her; while Ireland, with 8,000,000 of inhabitants, and 100 representatives, had 5 additional members given her. The right hon. Secretary for the Treasury had spoken much of the great increase of houses in Limerick, as a proof of the increasing prosperity of Ireland. There was, indeed, one new square in Limerick, called 'Rice Square,' but it had not a single tenant in any one of its houses; the only inhabitant of that empty square being the statue of the honourable member, which in lonely solitude occupied the centre of this otherwise untenanted space. He concluded by saying:

Ministers would have a majority against him; he called on them to follow up their triumphant majority by measures of justice and conciliation; especially now that they had it now in their power to provide amply for every Protestant clergyman in Ireland, whether he had duties to perform or not—to provide for all such individuals and their families, without having recourse to the vicious system of tithes,—now, when they might go further and provide amply for the spiritual wants of the Protestants of Ireland, but without establishing a sinecure church,—now, when they were told that a fair, equal, and impartial administration of justice was wanting in Ireland. Let not the Imperial Parliament, at this important juncture, stop him with imperfect reforms in the church and the law—do not offer a little paltry special jury bill, which might benefit the rich, but could not be of any advantage to the poor—a bill which only afforded justice to the man who could afford to give twelve guineas for its impartial administration. Do not this, but construct a system of fair and equal jury laws, and render it operative throughout the country; purify the waters of justice—convert them from a stagnant and noisome pool into a living and salutary stream, dispersing happiness and security through every part of the land. Do this and more—follow up your this night's victory as you ought: if not, the misfortune will be ours—the crime be yours!

The division being then called for, strangers were ordered to withdraw; and on counting the House the numbers were declared to be:—For the motion of Mr. O'Connell, 38; against it 523;—making a total number in the House, on the division, 561. It was, calculated, however, that at least 40 persons went away, from feeling themselves unable to vote either for the motion of Mr. O'Connell, or for the amendment of Mr. Rice, and therefore they absented themselves from both. Mr. Hume's amendment, as well as another from Mr. Mullins, was withdrawn; so that no division took place except that on Mr. O'Connell's motion, as the amendment of Mr. Rice was subsequently agreed to without a division.



The issue of the debate, in leaving only thirty-eight members, out of so full a House, in favour of any step towards a Repeal of the Union—especially too, considering that there was but one English member found in the minority (Mr. J. Kennedy, the member for Tiverton), and that the remaining thirty-seven is little more than one-third of the Irish members alone—ought certainly to set the question at rest for a long period at least, in order to see whether it may not be practicable to give to Ireland, by better measures, the full participation in all the benefits of the Union to which she is fairly entitled. For ourselves, we believe that most of the Irish Members who advocate a Repeal of the Union are sincere in their belief that it would benefit their country—but we also think they are mistaken, though we do not therefore impute bad motives to them, since it is quite as easy for Irishmen to be in error as Englishmen; and as we see proofs enough around us every day of the most sincere but obstinate adherence to the most palpable absurdities—we cannot, if we give credit to these for good intentions, in fairness deny the same indulgence to our Irish brethren. We believe, however, that they thought themselves stronger in the facts and arguments than they have proved themselves to be; and we think the exhibition of their weakness in this long debate will be of great public service. Before the debate began, we thought it *might* be possible to show that the Union had produced some of the evils admitted on both sides to exist; and that its repeal, might remedy some of the grievances of which the Irish complained. At least we were open to conviction, not having yet decided in our minds that this was impossible to be proved. The discussion has shown us, however, that the advocates of Repeal have failed in this most material part of the case—the showing these evils to have flowed from the Union—and the Union only—and the pointing out the manner in which they would be remedied by its repeal. If they could have done this, they would have done so for their own sakes; they have *not* done so, at least to our apprehensions; and, therefore, we think their case has broken down, and has for this reason met with no auxiliary support from others. We trust, however, that the exemplary patience with which the Irish Members were heard though five entire nights of the debate, and through all the early part of the sixth, will be taken in England as a great proof of the improved feeling and improved behaviour of the House, as compared with its conduct in the last session; and in Ireland we trust it will also be received as a proof that whatever may be the disposition of men in power to deny them justice, the House of Commons as a body has shown the deepest attention to their representatives, and manifested no triumph at their defeat; for, overwhelming as was the majority on the question in debate, the announcement of the numbers was received with the most respectful silence; no cheers of triumph, or expressions of unseemly exultation prevailed; but though here and there, in different corners of the House, a solitary murmur of approbation was heard, it was instantly hushed by the great body of the Members; and the declaration of the numbers from the Chair was received with the most calm and friendly forbearance.

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR.

## LOSS OF VESSELS BY WRECKS AT SEA—MERCHANT SEAMEN'S SIXPENCES.

SIR,

*South Shields, April, 1834.*

A few days before the Easter Recess, Mr. Ingham presented a petition (a copy of which I here inclose), from the seamen of this town, complaining of bad ships and unskilful commanders. In supporting the petition, you expressed a hope that in Sir James Graham's Bill, for the Regulation of the Merchant Service, a clause would be inserted, making it compulsory for marine officers to be examined, as to their abilities, to fill such and such stations. This is quite as necessary in this port as it is to examine the ships; for, by a printed registry of the ships, published up to the 1st instant, I find we have 983 vessels of 209,766 tons; and that since February, 1832, we have lost at sea, &c., 143 vessels of 30,778 tons, or more than one-seventh of the ships and tonnages of the port. But this is not wonderful when we consider our mode of insurance, our officers, and that our vessels consist of the refuse of all trades, and yet the oldest man I can find cannot tell of more than three ships being broken up in this port; but as they, like all things, will decay, they are left to founder at sea, which too often occurs with the whole or part of the crew, to the loss of many a family, those unwarrantable risks must in their turn be inspected into, or how can the owners of good ships compete with them in the market.

By this post, I send you from the seamen of this town, a petition (under weight), against the Greenwich Sixpences, the prayer of which, we humbly hope, you will support. By the returns sent us by Sir M. W. Ridley in 1831, we find the number of claimants in Greenwich Hospital to be 2710, to be supported by all the seamen in the kingdom, while we have in the Merchant Seamen's Fund, or Muster Roll of Newcastle, 1733 claimants, to be supported by the seamen of *this port alone*, and that too with half the sum collected; as the other half or more than 2200*l.* per annum is taken from us and given to Greenwich, from which, as stated in the petition, we cannot get any support. We, therefore, humbly trust, that this grievance and burthen may be taken from off our shoulders, as by our scanty earnings we are not able to support ourselves and families, though we are thus forced to give annually thousands to a large national establishment.

I am, Sir, your much obliged servant, for the Seamen of South Shields,

HENRY WOODROFFE.

## OBJECTIONS TO SOME OF THE DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED TAX ON PROPERTY AND INCOME.

SIR,

*Percy Cottage, April, 1834.*

THE article in your ninth Number, on the proposed "*Property and Income Tax*," is so full on the subject, and so clear in the exposition of its advantages as to leave little to be said, except in discussion on its details.

On some of these I differ from the article in question. The Tax on *Incomes* from *precarious* sources appears to me too high as compared with the others, unless such tax were to be *refunded* in proportion as *loss* instead of *gain* were to result from the uncertain speculation.\* But, to avoid all opening for fraud, and to preserve the perfect simplicity of the plan, I would lay aside all con-

---

\* Our intelligent Correspondent will remark on returning to the article, that the intention of the plan to which he adverts was, not to call for an estimate of *probable* or *uncertain* gains, in any future year; but to demand a declaration of the income *actually realized* in the year that had passed, and to tax that and that only; leaving all floating speculations untouched until their issue should be complete, when it would be quite time enough to tax the gain; and if there were no gain, then no tax would be payable.—EDITOR.

sideration for loss, and arrange the proportions on contingent Income, in the first instance, accordingly.

Now, were the Income from labour *certain*, I should think the present scale entirely too favourable to "Income from Perpetuities" as compared with those from labour, much more from those with which a precarious result is combined.

Again, on the principle that a person of 200*l.* per annum income can pay a tax of 2 per cent., as well or better than a person of only 100*l.* per annum, can pay 1 per cent.; on this principle, I say, the man of 250,000*l.* or 300,000*l.* per annum can pay a much higher rate of taxation than the man of 10,000*l.* or 20,000*l.*, yet in the proposed scale they are only taxed alike.\*

The last objection I shall make is to the multiplication of electoral votes to the possessors of large property; but I suppose the Scripture will still be fulfilled:—"To him that hath shall be given;" and I must acquiesce. This I am the more willing to do, as I am persuaded that, however favourably arranged the plan may be for property, its *general* benefits would be *so incalculable* as to remove all jealousy on *this* score, render the incomes from commerce and manufactures *scarcely precarious*, diffuse general employment, and as I am willing to anticipate, universal joy.

I shall not dash this view with a recapitulation of all the frauds, falsehoods, deceptions, prejudices, vexations, litigations, cruelties, immoralities, and other evils attendant on the *present* system, and which would then be swept away.

R. T. H.

\* \* Several Letters are still deferred for want of room.

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

### MAJORITY OF 257,

Tellers included, who, on the 21st of April, voted for Lord Althorp's motion,—"That from and after a time to be fixed, the payment of Church Rates shall cease and determine; and that in lieu thereof His Majesty be empowered to grant, out of the proceeds of the land tax, a sum not exceeding 250,000*l.* to be applied to the repairs of parish churches and parochial chapels."

### ENGLAND.

Althorp, Lord	Bolling, W.	Clive, E. B.	Eastcourt, T. G. B.
Anson, Sir G.	Brodie, T. B.	Clive, Viscount	Etwell, R.
Ashley, Lord	Bruce, Lord E.	Clive, Hon. R. H.	Fazakerly, I. N.
Astley, Sir J.	Brudenell, Lord	Cooper, Hn. A. H. A.	Ferguson, Gen. R.
Astley, Sir J. D.	Bulkeel, J. C.	Crawley, S.	Feilden, W.
Banks, W. J.	Burrell, Sir C.	Curteis, H. B.	Finch, G.
Barham, J.	Burton, H.	Curteis, Capt. E. B.	Fitzroy, Lord J.
Baring, A.	Byng, Sir J., K.C.B.	Crawford, W.	Fleetwood, P. H.
Baring, F. T.	Calcraft, J.	Darlington, Earl of	Foley, J. H. H.
Baring, H. B.	Carter, J. B.	Duffield, T.	Foley, E. T.
Barnett, C. J.	Cartwright, W. R.	Dugdale, W. S.	Forester, G. C. W.
Beaumont, T. W.	Cavendish, Hon. Col.	Duncombe, Hon. W.	Forster, O. S.
Bell, M.	Chandos, Marquis of	Durham, Sir P. C.	Fort, J.
Bennett, J.	Chapman, A.	Eastnor, Viscount	Fox, S. L.
Bentinck, Lord G. F.	Chaytor, W. R. C.	Ebrington, Viscount	Fox, Lieut.-Col. C.
Bethell, E. R.	Chaytor, Sir W.	Egerton, W. T.	Freemantle, Sir T.
Blackstone, W. S.	Chetwynd, Opt. W. F.	Ellice, E.	Gaskell, James
Blunt, Sir C. C. R.	Childers, J.	Edwards, J.	Gladstone, W. E.

\* The principle of this is not questioned, and in strict justice, so it ought to be; but the stopping at a moderate maximum of 15 per cent., and the increase of electoral votes, would reconcile many of the higher classes, whom nothing would bring over to a graduated scale founded on more severe and rigid rules of equitable proportion.

—Editor.

Glynn, Sir S.	Kerrison, Sir E.	Pepys, C.	Stanley, E. J.
Gordon, R.	King, E. B.	Peter, W.	Staunton, G. T.
Goulburn, Hon. H.	Labouchere, H.	Phillips, C. M.	Stewart, E.
Graham, Sir J. R. G.	Langston, J. H.	Phillipotts, J.	Strickland, G.
Green, T. G.	Lefevre, C. S.	Pigot, R.	Tayleure, W.
Grey, Hon. Col.	Lemon, Sir C.	Pollock, F.	O'Connell, Hon. M. A.
Grey, Sir G.	Lennox, G.	Price, R.	Thomson, Hon. C. P.
Grimstoe, Viscont.	Lewis, Hon. T. F.	Ramsden, J. C.	Throckmorton, R. G.
Gronow, Capt. R. H.	Lincoln, Earl of	Reid, Sir J. R.	Tower, C. T.
Guise, Sir B. W.	Littleton, E. J.	Rickford, W.	Trounbridge, Sir E. T.
Halcombe, J.	Lopes, Sir R.	Rider, T.	Tyrell, Sir J. T.
Halford, H.	Lowther, Col. H.	Ridley, Sir M. W.	Verney, Sir H.
Handley, W. F.	Lumley, Viscount	Rolfe, R. M.	Vernon, Hon. G. J.
Hanmer, Sir J.	Lushington, Dr.	Ross, C.	Vivian, Sir H.
Hanmer, Col. H.	Lygon, Col. M. B.	Russell, Lord J.	Vyvyann, Sir R.
Hardinge, Sir H.	Lyall, G.	Russell, C.	Wilbraham, G.
Hardy, J.	Maberly, Colonel	Byle, J.	Williams, T. P.
Hawes, B.	Manners, Lord R.	Scrope, C. P.	Willoughby, Sir H.
Heathcote, J.	Marjoribanks, S.	Sanderson, R.	Wood, G. W.
Henniker, Lord E.	Marsland, T.	Sandon, Viscount	Wood, Colonel T.
Herbert, Hon. S.	Milton, Viscount	Sanford, E. A.	Wall, C. B.
Hodges, T. L.	Morpeth, Viscount	Scarlett, Sir J.	Walsh, Sir J. B.
Horne, Sir W.	Mosley, Sir O.	Scott, J. W.	Ward, H. G.
Houldsworth, T.	Miles, W.	Scott, Sir E. D.	Warre, J. A.
Hope, H. T.	Neale, Sir H. B.	Sheppard, T.	Waterpark, Lord
Howick, Lord	Nicholl, J.	Simeon, Sir R. G.	Watkins, J. L.
Hawkes, T.	Norreys, Lord	Skipwith, Sir G.	Wason, Hon. R.
Hughes, W. H.	North, F.	Slaney, R. A.	Wedgwood, J.
Irton, S.	Paget, F.	Smith, J.	Weyland, Major R.
Inglis, Sir R.	Palmer, C. F.	Smith, R. V.	Whitbread, W. H.
Jernyn, Earl	Palmer, R.	Somersat, Lord G.	Wrottesley, Sir J.
Jerningham, H. V. S.	Patten, J. W.	Spankie, Mr. Serj.	Wynn, Hon. C. W.
Johnstone, Sir J. V.	Pechell, Sir S. J. B.	Spencer, Hn. Capt. F.	Yorke, Capt. C. P.
Jolliffe, H.	Peel, Hon. Sir R.	Stanley, Rt. Hon. E.	Young, G. T.
Keppel, Major G.	Pendarves, E. W.	Stanley, E.	

## SCOTLAND.

Adam, Admiral C.	Campbell, Sir H.	Hay, Colonel A. L.	Murray, J. A.
Agnew, Sir A.	Elliot, Hon. Capt. G.	Jeffrey, Rt. Hon. F.	Rae, Sir W.
Bannerman, A.	Ferguson, Capt. G.	Johnston, A.	Stclair, G.
Bruce, C.	Grant, Rt. Hon. C.	Loch, J.	Wemyss, Captain J.
Callender, J. H.	Hay, Sir J.	Mackenzie, J. A. S.	

## IRELAND.

Bateson, Sir R.	Coote, Sir C. H.	Howard, R.	O'Callaghan, Hon. C.
Belfast, Earl of	Corry, Hon. H. L.	Lefroy, Dr. T.	O'Reilly, W.
Browne, D.	Daly, J.	M'Namara, Major W.	Perceval, Colonel
Carew, R. S.	Dobbin, L.	M'Namara, F.	Stawell, Colonel
Castlereagh, Visct.	Forbes, Lord	Martin, J.	Talbot, J.
Christmas, J. N.	Hayes, Sir E.	Maxwell, H.	Tennant, J. E.
Cole, Lord	Hill, Lord M.	Mullins, F. W.	White, Sir
Conolly, Col. E. M.			

PAIRED OFF.—Ricd Hon. T. S.—Tancred, H. W.

TELLERS.—Hume, J.—Wood C.

## MINORITY OF 16,

Tellers included, who, on the 24th of April, voted against the second reading of the Bill for Repealing the Foreign Enlistment Bill.

Bateson, Sir R.	Eastnor, Viscount	Forster, G.	Pease, J.
Brotherton, J.	Ewing, J.	Gladstone, W. E.	Perceval, Colonel
Bruce, Lord E.	Estcourt, T. G.	Inglis, Sir R.	Plumptree, J. P.
Cole, Lord	Finch, G.	Johnston, A.	Verner, Colonel

## MAJORITY OF 55,

Tellers included, who, on the 24th of April, voted in favour of Mr. Grant's motion for the Removal of Jewish Civil Disabilities.

Aglionby, H. A.	Gordon, R.	Mullins, F. W.	Strutt, E.
Attwood, T.	Gisborne, T.	O'Connell, M.	Stewart, P. M.
Buckingham, J. S.	Howard, P. H.	O'Connell, M.	Stewart, Sir M. S.
Buller, J. W.	Hgathcote, J.	Parrott, J.	Stanley, E. J.
Brotherton, J.	Hume, J.	Parker, J.	Tooke, W.
Bish, T.	Jeffrey, Rt. Hon. F.	Philips, M.	Tennyson, Rt. Hn. C.
Blake, M.	Lalor, P.	Pease, J.	Talbot, J.
Baring, F.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Peter, W.	Vigors, N. A.
Cayley, Sir G.	Lyall, G.	Ponsonby, Hn. W. F.	Wason, R.
Cayley, E. S.	Murray, J.	Pelham, Hn. G. A.	Warburton, H.
Chichester, J. P. B.	Molyneux, Lord	Ruthven, E.	Wallace, R.
Dunlop, P.	M'Leod, R.	Ruthven, E. S.	Wood, G. W.
Dillwyn, L. W.	Marryat, J.	Rolfe, R. M.	Young, G. F.
Evans, W.			

TELLERS.—Grant, R.—Wood, C.

## MINORITY OF 11,

Tellers included, who, on the 24th of April, voted against the introduction of a Bill to remove the Civil Disabilities of the Jews.

Bruce, Lord E.	Ferguson, Captain	Inglis, Sir R.	Perceval, Colonel
Estcourt, T. G. B.	Forster, C.	Johpston, A.	Plumtre, J. P.
Finch, G.	Gladstone, W. E.	Maxwell, H.	

## MINORITY of 40,

Tellers included, who, on the 29th of April, voted for Mr. O'Connell's motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the propriety of continuing the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland.

Baldwin, Dr.	Fitzgerald, T.	O'Connell, D.	Ronayne, D.
Bellew, P.	Galway, J.	O'Connell, M.	Roche, D.
Blackney, W.	Grattan, H.	O'Connell, M.	Roche, W.
Blake, M. J.	Kennedy, J.	O'Connell, J.	Ruthven, E.
Butler, Hon. P.	Lalor, P.	O'Connell, C.	Ruthven, E. S.
Barron, W.	Lynch, A. H.	O'Connor, Don	Sullivan, R.
Callaghan, D.	M'Namara, W.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Talbot, J. H.
Fitzsimon, N.	M'Namara, F.	O'Brien, C.	Vigors, N. A.
Fitzsimon, C.	Mullins, F.	Roe, J.	Walker, C. A.
Finn, W.	Nagle, Sir R.		

TELLERS.—O'Connor, F.—Sheil, R. L.

For the Motion, 40; Against it, 525.

## MINORITY of 17,

Tellers included, who, on the 29th of April, voted against the motion of Sir Edward Knatchbull, for introducing a New Bill to regulate the Sale of Beer.

## ENGLAND.

Aglionby, H. A.	Evans, Col.	Hawes, B.	Strickland, Sir G.
Childers, J. W.	Gisborne, T.	Roebeck, J. A.	Thicknesse, R.

## SCOTLAND.

Oswald, J. Wallace, R.

## IRELAND.

Blake, M.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Ruthven, E.	Vigors, N. A.
-----------	----------------	-------------	---------------

TELLERS.—Hume, J.—Warburton, H.

For the Motion, 102; Against it, 17.

C. Whiting, Beaufort House, Strand.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1834.

SKETCH OF DANIEL WHITTLE HARVEY, ESQ., M.P.  
FOR THE TOWN OF COLCHESTER.

THE Debate on the Pension List, which took place on Monday, and which was so ably led by Mr. Harvey, both on the present and on a former occasion, has brought that gentleman so distinctly and so recently before the public, that we think this the fittest moment for placing the Honourable Member in our Gallery of PARLIAMENTARY PORTRAITS.—Another reason may be added also to this :—

Mr. O'Connell having surrendered his motion touching the powers and privileges of the Inns of Court into the hands of the Solicitor-General, Sir William Pepys, and that legal functionary having pledged himself to bring in speedily a bill to define and limit the powers of these irresponsible bodies, we do not think we can do a more acceptable service to our readers than to prepare them for the consideration of a topic which must shortly engage the attention of Parliament. The development of the general question affords, too, a fitting opportunity to make a few observations on the case of Mr. Harvey, which has just been published,\* and on the Parliamentary career and capabilities of that eminent but very ill-used Member.

Mr. Harvey was born in the county of Essex, in the year 1786. His father had married an heiress, a Miss Whittle, of Feering House, near Kelvedon. Their son, the subject of this Sketch, received, we believe, the first rudiments of education at a Dissenting School in his native county. In his sixteenth year he was articled to Mr. Winburn, (of the firm of Winburn, Collett, and Co.), Chancery Lane. On coming of age, in 1807, he took possession of his maternal estate, called Feering House, near Kelvedon, a village about nine miles from Colchester; and three from Coggeshall. The inheritance of this property did not prevent Mr. Harvey from pursuing his profession. He was shortly after admitted an Attorney of the Court of King's Bench, and soon obtained very considerable practice. In the year 1811,

\* Report of the Proceedings on the Investigation before the Benchers of the Inner Temple, upon the application of D. W. Harvey, Esq., to be called to the Bar. Second edition. Chelmsford: Printed and Sold by Chalk and Co.

Mr. Harvey was admitted a student of the Honourable Society of the Inner Temple, having at this time married the only daughter of Ebenezer Johnston, Esq., of Stamford Hill, with whom, it is said, he had a fortune of 30,000*l.* sterling.

It may be a matter of information to the lay reader to state that the Inns of Court are four in number, viz., Lincoln's Inn, the Inner Temple, the Middle Temple, and Gray's Inn. These institutions were anciently called *Hospitia Curiarum*; "because," says Fortescue, "the students therein do not only study the law to enable them to practise in the Courts at Westminster, but also pursue such other studies as may render them better qualified to serve the King in his court." They are governed by Masters, Principals, Benchers, Stewards; and the chief of them have chapels for divine service, and all of them public halls for exercises, readings, and arguments, which the students were obliged to perform and attend for a competent number of years before their call to the Bar. Nevertheless, the Inns of Court are not corporations, nor have they any judicial power over their members, but they have, says Mr. Tomlins, "certain orders among themselves which by consent have the force of laws; for light offences persons are only excommunicated, or put out of commons; for greater they lose their chambers, and are expelled; and when they are expelled out of one society they shall never be received by any of the others." Each Inn consists of a select number of members, known as Benchers, a considerable and varying number of Students, as also of Barristers; and the rules for their government are nearly the same in each Inn. The Benchers exercise the right of receiving into the Society of the Inn or rejecting whom they please, and also the power of making laws to bind the members.

In pursuance of this right, a rule was passed subsequent to Mr. Harvey's admission, to the effect that no one should be called to the Bar who had not ceased to practise as an attorney for two years prior to his application. In obedience to this rule, Mr. Harvey, in 1819, when, as he alleges, his practice as a Solicitor was more than 2000*l.* per annum, caused his name to be erased from the Roll of Attorneys. Up to the period of his relinquishment of this valuable practice, Mr. Harvey received no intimation that his claim to be called to the Bar would be refused. In June, 1821, having qualified himself, by a compliance with the regulations of the Society, Mr. Harvey, for the first time, applied to be called to the Bar, but was then informed that objections to his call had arisen out of two actions with which he had been professionally mixed up. These were the cases of *Harvey v. Andrew*, and *Frost v. Harvey*. As, however, the facts should be placed before our readers, we shall give them in the words of the Report.

He obtained permission to appear before the Benchers, and did so on the 6th and 9th of November, in the Parliament Chamber of the Inner Temple, when he was heard in support of his claim, but was not informed as to what points in particular his attention should be directed. He was permitted to make what statements he pleased, and offered both parol and documentary evidence, some of which the Benchers received, and some they rejected, but they did not intimate to him the particular points to which his attention should be directed, nor the evidence which they required. This investigation having closed, Mr.

Harvey, on the 13th Nov. 1821, received a communication that the opinion of the Masters was adverse to his application to be called to the Bar.

Early in December, 1821, Mr. Harvey appealed against this rejection to the Twelve Judges who act as Visitors over the Inns of Court, praying that their Lordships would call upon the Masters of the Bench to certify their objections to his demand to be called to the Bar, and that they would appoint a day for hearing him, either in person, or by counsel, in appeal. In compliance with this petition, the Masters of the Bench were required to certify their objections, and they did so in a Certificate, dated 30th January, 1822.

The day appointed by the Judges for the hearing on Mr. Harvey's petition, was the 1st of February, 1822, and he complains that though he applied to the Benchers in the preceding November for a statement of the grounds upon which his claim to be called to the Bar had been rejected, he did not receive a copy of their Certificate, *till within a very few hours of the time appointed for the hearing of his appeal.*

The Judges having stated it to be their intention 'to hear all parties,' Mr. Harvey appeared at Serjeant's Inn, with his Counsel (Mr. Brougham and Mr. Denman), many witnesses, and much documentary testimony. The Counsel having concluded their arguments, the Judges ordered the room to be cleared of all parties except Mr. Harvey, his Counsel, and Solicitor; and to Mr. Harvey's great astonishment refused to hear witnesses or to inspect the documents tendered, and relying on the *ex-parte* allegation contained in the Certificate of the Benchers, signified their approval of their decision.

Though thus harshly treated, Mr. Harvey resolved not to abandon the object which he had in view. He found that the injustice which he had sustained abated the confidence of neither his constituents nor of his private friends; and at last he was so fortunate as to obtain such further evidence to rebut the charges against him as he and his friends considered could not fail to clear his reputation in the eyes of every man unblinded by prejudice. Conscious of the justice of his cause, he was, and ever has shown himself, most anxious for inquiry—not a private—but a full and open one before the public; and, accordingly, on the 2d of April, 1833, Mr. Harvey again petitioned the Judges. In that Petition he complained of the manner in which the Judges had decided on the former appeal, and then went on to state that after this, knowing that the names of persons whose applications to be called to the Bar were, as a matter of course, erased from the books of the Society, he (Mr. H.) on the advice of one of the Masters, that it would be more satisfactory to them and more becoming in him, and being utterly without redress, requested to have his name erased, which was done accordingly, leaving him with the impression that he had a right to a subsequent appeal, for a review of his case. He then set forth that he now had it in his power to produce unimpeachable evidence of the truth of his original statements, and to rebut, *seriatim*, the allegations of the Masters' Certificate, by the production of the agreement between him and Mr. Skingley, and other evidence, oral and written.

In consequence of Mr. Harvey's petition, he obtained another hear-



ing on Friday, the 7th of last June. At half-past six o'clock, Mr. Harvey, accompanied by Mr. Serjeant Wilde, and a junior counsel, was admitted to the Parliament Chamber. When the case was called, Mr. Harvey said, he trusted, that in the first place, as the question was a public one, the investigation would not be private. There were many gentlemen interested in the matter (several of whom were Members of Parliament), waiting to be admitted. There were also the reporters of the public press, who, he trusted, would not be excluded; for the reason he had already stated. After some consultation, the Benchers decided that no persons could be admitted but those who belonged to the Inn as Benchers. They agreed, however, as a point of principle, to the admission of two short-hand writers, one on behalf of Mr. Harvey, and the other on behalf of the Inn. Mr. Harvey declined this, expressing his wish to have the matter discussed as openly as possible. Mr. Harvey found that he had no other means of obtaining a re-hearing, and subsequently addressed the Masters, expressing his wish to be heard in any manner they might deem consistent with the claims of justice. The result has been the investigation, which commenced on Tuesday the 19th of November, 1833; and which, after being pursued for, we believe, seven successive nights, terminated in the following final decision :

" Inner Temple—Bench Table, Thursday, the 23d of January 1834—At a Special Meeting of the Masters of the Bench of this Society to take into consideration the renewed application of Daniel Whittle Harvey, Esq., to be called to the Bar, accompanied by a copy of his petition to the Judges.

" Upon taking into consideration the renewed application of Mr. Daniel Whittle Harvey, to be called to the Bar, and the evidence adduced in support of the same, and the arguments of the Learned Counsel thereon,

" It is Unanimously Resolved,—that the Bench do not see any sufficient reason to alter the Resolution of the Bench, communicated to Mr. Harvey by the Treasurer of the Society, on the 13th of November, 1821, against his application to be called to the Bar.

" EDWARD H. MARTIN, SUB-TREASURER."

On this decision becoming public, Mr. O'Connell took up the question with praiseworthy celerity; the topic excited much interest, and the public at length began to perceive that the power here arrogated by nineteen individuals (for the most part unknown to fame), was irresponsible, undefined, and had been exercised to the manifest oppression of a gentleman, who was deemed by a large constituency, full worthy enough to sit in the greatest council of the nation in six successive Parliaments, was declared by nineteen Masters of the Bench unworthy to hold the smallest petty larceny brief which was ever delivered by Mr. Alderman Harmer at the Old Bailey.

This is certainly a state of things which cannot—and which we shall add, ought not—to continue long. It is, however, to be regretted that Mr. O'Connell suffered the question of the inns of court to be taken out of his hands. We very much fear that the Solicitor General will not apply to the correction of the monstrous abuses of those monopolies those strong and radical remedies which the nature of the disease imperiously demands. Let us not be misunderstood. We are as anxious to maintain the dignity, the independence, the learning, the high character of the Bar, as any men breathing, but we do not think these ends can be attained—we know they are not attained—by the arbitrary and undefined power which exists in the hands of the Benchers.

There is no profession in England that contains within itself a greater fund of intelligence, of learning, of mental vigour, and general information, than the Bar; but there are now, and we believe there have always been, some black sheep in the profession. One man, who had been in early life a bankrupt, is now an eminent compiler of works of practice—another, who a few years ago had been a city light porter, now wears a wig and gown—a third, who had been an attorney's office sweeper, and subsequently an attorney, is now a man in some practice on the Western Circuit—a fourth, who had been a cobbler, has since given an edition of Coke upon Littleton.—We might go on *ad infinitum* with a list of men who had risen from small beginnings, chiefly by unworthy means, and who have subsequently become barristers, yet these individuals have been admitted, though Mr. Harvey has been refused. In the instances cited by us there was abundant dullness—great mediocrity—unbounded servility—and these being qualities which find favour in the sight of the homogenous Bench, the candidates passed muster at once. But in Mr. Harvey's case there was a broad distinction. He was a man of quickness and parts, and sure to rise rapidly. He was, moreover, a Dissenter, an uncompromising Reformer in Church and State, a thorough detector of abuses, a sworn foe to the Pension List. His parts excited the jealousy, and his politics the dread, of the worthy Inner-Templars, and accordingly they lay hold of a loose report of a trial, to refuse a profession to a man whom they had admitted as a student in 1811, *on the usual certificates of qualification and character*—whose admission-fee they had pocketed—fraudulently denying the consideration for which it was paid!

After a lapse of years, Mr. Harvey obtains documentary evidence to clear away the imputations sought to be cast on his character, in the cases alluded to, and to put to shame his accusers; but does this evidence avail him? Not one jot. The Benchers continue in the same frame of mind—they shelter themselves from the shame of the acknowledgment of having passed an iniquitous sentence, by abiding in their former opinion—they, forsooth, are too much of *gentlemen* to acknowledge themselves in the wrong! Judges in their own behalf they pronounce a sentence in their own favour. They agree one and all to sacrifice Mr. Harvey rather than expose themselves. How otherwise can we conclude, when we read, that long after public attention had been drawn to the refusal to call Mr. Harvey, that gentleman found no difficulty in getting readmitted as an attorney; and that at the next election for Colchester, all parties in the county of Essex—where if there were a ground for the prevalence of a feeling that Mr. Harvey had taken an advantage of his client in a purchase, such a feeling would be sure to prevail—at the next election, we say, Mr. Harvey experienced no opposition. This was in the county, and almost on the spot where, if a fraud had been committed, it would have been known, and where the matter must have been generally discussed. To this the Benchers rejoin: “But why did not Mr. H. move for a new trial,” whereupon Serjeant Wilde, his counsel, replies: •

• “If he were asked why Mr. Harvey did not move for a new trial, his answer would be—to satisfy whom? If it were said he had shown himself insensible to character, he would ask how? By not putting affidavits on the file of the Court of King's Bench? Why, if he had met the charge in his own county, he had satisfied a much larger circle

than that of the Court of King's Bench. Was it true that he rested under a stigma? The insinuation was that he had no character to lose, or was insensible to the imputation on it; and yet, he was found taking pains far and wide, and efficient, to clear himself. Did he remove from the county? Did he become an exile? No! so far from taking no pains to clear himself, he never ceased to do so. What body of men had he not challenged? What frequent appeals had he not made to this Bench? Suppose he had acted with the same spirit with all others as he had with this Bench, could it be said that he had taken no pains to clear himself? The same might be said elsewhere. Look at his advertisement the day after the report of the trial appeared: was that taking no pains? After publishing all over the county that Mr. Frost had renounced the charge, how could it be said that he had not cleared himself? He had not taken the view that some persons might have taken who might have thought than an affidavit before the Court of King's Bench would be more satisfactory; he might err on that, but that he made an appeal long and loudly, was clear; and if he had not gone into the Court of King's Bench, he had satisfied all whose opinions he had to consult.

Mr. Harvey has sat for Colchester since 1818—he was a law student in 1811—he is now a readmitted attorney—yet being qualified as a Member of Parliament—as a candidate for the Bar—and twice as a Solicitor—he may not be admitted to the degree of Utter Barrister! This is the monstrous but yet legitimate deduction from the Report of the Proceedings before the Masters of the Bench.

Having said so much on one of the main features of Mr. Harvey's life, it is now our duty to turn to his Parliamentary career. If we have given more space than may appear fitting to the bulk of our readers, to a matter apparently of little moment, let such individuals reflect that the lives and liberties of Englishmen are to a great extent in the keeping of the Bar, and that, therefore, it never can be a matter of indifference to the community at large, in whose hands resides the power of admission or rejection. We already know that not only one of the most learned, but one of the ablest men of the past age, was refused admission to the degree of Barrister; and the case of Mr. Harvey, in our own time, a man, who, if he does not possess the erudition, certainly possesses all the clearness, precision, and power of mind of a Horne Tooke, justifies an over watchfulness on the part of the public. Had Mr. Tooke or Mr. Harvey been dull and plodding dunces—of the obscurest birth, and the most ignoble pursuits—had they been the stupidest clerks that ever engrossed on parchment, or indited a stanza on paper, they had been admitted with a claim, provided only their politics had been as slavish as their progress had been slimy and tortuous; but Tooke and Harvey were too able to be parasites, and too original to follow in the wake of routine—and hence the disfavour which they encountered at the hands of men dressed in a “little brief authority,” which they have in these instances greatly abused.

As a Member of Parliament—notwithstanding the grievous wrong inflicted on him by these Benchers—Mr. Harvey stands in the very first rank. For sixteen years he has represented Colchester, with eminent ability and great public usefulness; and the burgesses of this town, always renowned for the *auri sacra fames*, seem to have considered that the real utility of Mr. Harvey was such that they might dis-

pense in his regard with the payment of the parliamentary toll which they levied so unsparingly on his predecessors.

As a speaker, Mr. Harvey does not trouble the House very frequently, and rarely at any inordinate length; but such is the clearness and lucidness of his views—such the pith, polish, and power of his periods—such his readiness, skilfulness, and address—such his brevity, point, and force—that he is always sure of a willing and attentive audience, at a season when no other man, except, perhaps, Sir Robert Peel, or Mr. Stanley, could command it. This arises partly from the very great relish of the House for really good speeches—but infinitely more from the tact and address with which Mr. Harvey manages his audience. His discourses are admirably seasoned. Here there is a drop of vinegar—there a spoonful of oil—now a dash of attic salt—and again a sprinkling of pungent mustard—but as a whole, the salad is perfect—no one ingredient predominates—it is a happy mixture, well and harmoniously blended, and such as old Evelyn\* himself would love to taste.

There is no other man in the House of Commons with whom Mr. Harvey may be compared. He certainly has not the genius and fire of Mr. Stanley—nor the classic attainments and general literature of Sir Robert Peel—he does not exhibit the varied historical knowledge of Mr. Macauley—or the sharp wit, playful fancy, and critical acrimony of Mr. Croker—but he is superior to them all in plain perspicuity of diction—in clearness, lucidness, and forceful brevity. We do not mean to say that there is either theoretic originality, or philosophic depth, in the views or opinions of Mr. Harvey; but there is what is far better for the every-day concerns of human life, a clear and nervous diction—"a well of English undefiled"—a quickness of conception—a readiness of retort and reply—a solid-headed shrewdness and good sense, joined to active business-like habits, which render him what we would call an eminently English speaker of the best class, though not, perhaps, the best and aptest pupil of the school. In the age just gone by, Mr. Tierney was beyond all doubt and question the first man of this particular school. Possessing the utmost shrewdness of discernment—the most perspicuous views of trade and finance—the most powerful because the most intelligible logic—a diction fluent, forcible, and easy—and, above all, the most penetrating sarcasm, and the most invulnerable self-possession—he stood almost the last of this class of English orators. Mr. Tierney left behind him two men somewhat of a similar order of mind. One of them, Lord Lyndhurst, now ornaments the Upper House—the other, Mr. Harvey, will ever remain in St. Stephen's Chapel. These two men greatly resemble each other in character and conformation of mind. Neither the one nor the other have ever uttered an obscure sentence, or wearied their auditors by long parentheses, obsolete diction, or seven hours' harangues. Neither the one nor the other have ever so overloaded their displays with figures and facts, as to deaden all attention, and to bewilder all attempts at recollection. They are both British in feelings—British in birth—British in diction. Judiciously mingling together fact and argument—opinion and inference—applause and

\* It is not generally known that John Evelyn wrote a most amusing tract, on what he called "The Admixture of Salets."

invective—reason and ridicule—they leave Scotch metaphysics to those orators of the North British School, who deeming obscurity a source of the sublime, rival in prolix verbosity, the unhappy lengthiness and paraded pedantry of the present Chancellor, who really mars his wonderful powers of exposition and invective, by the adoption of an obsolete phraseology, and the repetition, in endless periphrasis, of the same exhausted idea. Of these vices Lord Lyndhurst and Mr. Harvey are free. They both shine alone in the clearness—the precision—and the cleanness, if we may so say, with which they turn the happiest thoughts into the most forcible and English diction. They both shine, too, in the use of that small-sword logic whose brevity constitutes its force. Here, however, the parallel must cease; for though Nature has done to the full as much for Mr. Harvey as for Lord Lyndhurst, it must in candour be admitted that education, culture, and practice, have made Lord Lyndhurst not only one of the first classical and scientific scholars, but the first lawyer on the Bench—and one, perhaps, of the very best speakers in all England.

But more on this subject on a future day, when we shall present our readers with a Sketch of Lord Lyndhurst; and when, perhaps, we may also notice the extraordinary conduct which it is understood the present Lord Chancellor, and others of his colleagues, have observed towards the Honourable Member for Colchester, as it regards his appointment to the important office of Solicitor to the Commission for the Correction of Abuse in the Public Charities.

#### CAUSE

AN erroneous theory is often found to in laying down the first principles of it with Thompson's 'True theory.' He quantity of the land in comparison with the competition is not for the produce these competitors to use the land in the they will supply themselves with produce in the sea, as well as for landed produce separate class who tax fishermen, the cost of fish to rise so high as to afford the price. If fishermen attempted to charge such price, other persons would become fishermen, increase the supply, bring down the price, and make the trade of the fisherman yield not more than ordinary wages. The produce of the land is scarce, and high in price, *not merely* because the land is limited in quantity, for the sea is also limited in quantity, but because those who want landed produce are not permitted to raise that produce from the land, without paying a consideration or rent for the permission to those who have appropriated the land to their own exclusive use. If no consideration of that kind were required, a fisherman or a manufacturer would not give the fruits of eight days' labour for the fruits of six days of agricultural labour. If so unequal an exchange were required, some of the manufacturers or fishermen would transfer their labour from manufactures or fishing to agriculture; and thus, by increasing the supply of landed produce, and decreasing the supply of manufactures or fish, establish an equilibrium in their exchangeable values. Such a transfer is prevented only by the exaction of a rent. It cannot be true, then, that rent arises from the competitors for landed produce being numerous compared with the quantity of land, seeing that all which these competitors want is to be permitted to labour on the limited quantity of land which is in existence, in order to raise that produce for themselves.—Hopkins's *Great Britain for the last Forty Years*.

## REJECTION OF THE BILL FOR ENFORCING THE OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH.

As there are many Members in the House who are favourable to the principle of some regulations for ensuring the rest of man and beast, on one day in seven, who would yet limit those regulations to what might be called the *civil* observance of this day of rest, and avoid every interference with *religious* freedom—so there were many who voted in favour of the motion to allow Sir Andrew Agnew to bring in his Bill, in order that, by being printed, its provisions might be seen and examined, without pledging themselves to the support of that Bill if its provisions were objectionable when it came to a second reading. Of this number we profess ourselves to be.

We are satisfied, that as a purely civil ordinance, it is of the utmost value to the public health, and public morals, that there should be a respite from the toils and labours of life, one day in seven, both for man and beast; and that the lower we descend in the scale of society, the more essential will such a respite be found for its members. The Bill of Sir Andrew Agnew, however, even in a civil sense, proceeded upon the very opposite maxim; for, while it allowed the rich—to whom such respite and recreation is least of all necessary, since their toils are least severe—to go where they pleased in search of fresh air and healthy exercise on the seventh day, it absolutely prohibited, by the restrictions it imposed, the same enjoyments to the poorer classes, who most stood in need of them. In a civil point of view, therefore, his Bill was most objectionable, as it imposed restraints on those who most required to be left free—and left free those whom it might with most propriety restrain. Added to which, its provisions were absolutely impracticable—and would be therefore useless.

In a religious point of view the objections to his Bill were still stronger. It is well known that the Jewish sabbath was observed with a rigour so extreme, as that “no manner of work” was permitted to be done on it, either by “the man-servant, the maid-servant, the cattle, or the stranger within the gates”—that “no fire was allowed to be kindled in any habitation”—and that the words of Moses, in delivering the Commandment, were, “Whosoever doeth work therein shall surely be put to death.” This was the mode in which the Jewish sabbath was kept; and so recently as the siege of Jerusalem by the Roman army, when the Jews were attacked on the sabbath, they refused to offer the slightest resistance, and suffered an immense slaughter because they would not violate the sanctity of that day.

Now, the abolition of this mode of observing the sabbath was clearly

effected at the coming of the Messiah, both by his precept and example; and while he went about doing good on the sabbath as well as on other days, he repelled the rebukings of those who charged him with the violation of the law, by showing them that it was *lawful* to be usefully occupied on that day.

If, by the change from the ceremonial law of the Jews to the moral law of Christianity, the rigorous severity of the observance of the sabbath was abolished, so also was the day of rest itself changed. The seventh day, or fast of the Jews, which was observed as a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites from their Egyptian Captivity, gave place to the first day, or festival of the Christians, in commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ from the tomb. The whole spirit and genius of the observance of this holiday was therefore totally different from that of the Jews; and accordingly the apostles and disciples, and early fathers of the Christian church, perpetually disclaim all reverence for the Jewish ceremonials, by which the sabbath was observed under the Mosaic dispensation, and regard the first day of the week as set apart for the conjoint purpose of reposing from the toils of worldly occupation in pursuit of gain, and for celebrating, with music, and hymns, and festive recreations, their emancipation from all the burdens of sin and ceremonial expiation, by rejoicing in the fullness of the great sacrifice made for all, in the death of Him by whose resurrection came life and immortality.

From this, it appears to us, that persons of every denomination are exempt from the duties of any other observance of the sabbath of the Jews, or of the feast day of the Christians, which are clearly very different in their nature as well as in their date, than that which their own consciences may suggest; and that provided securities be taken for perfect liberty being left to all, to devote the day to such observance of devotion or of recreation as the individuals themselves may see fit, and for no encroachment being made by any on the most perfect command which every one ought to have, if he desired it, of employing the day as he thought proper, so that he did not infringe on the same liberty and the same enjoyment in others: provided this can be done, all that legislation can or ought to accomplish will be effected.

In the debate on the second reading of Sir Andrew Agnew's Bill, Mr. E. L. Bulwer made the most entertaining—Mr. Potter the most practical—Mr. Roebuck the most severe and denouncing—and Mr. O'Connell the most indignant and demolishing speech of the evening. Nothing daunted by this, however, Mr. Baines, and Mr. Fleetwood, each gave notice of their intention to introduce another Bill for the better observance of the Sabbath. Mr. Baines has since, we believe, resigned the matter into Mr. Fleetwood's hands; but from the feeling of the House on the subject we think there is no Member who could carry through any Bill that would satisfy the advocates of legislating for the strict observance of the sabbath, at least in the present Session.

## ON THE PRESENT DETERIORATED CONDITION OF OUR MERCANTILE SHIPPING.

WE need not now inform our readers of the deep interest that we feel in every thing connected with British ships and British seamen. They are sufficiently aware of that fact, and of its causes, to give us credit for at least perfect sincerity in all our endeavours to improve the quality of the one and better the condition of the other. We have, therefore, great pleasure in giving more extended publicity to some observations contained in an article originally published in the *Edinburgh Patriot*—but worthy of the attention of our readers in the South, as well as those in the North, and especially by the Members of both Houses of Parliament, to whom the facts are, we fear, but little known.

In an age like the present, when every thing affecting, however trivially, the public interests, is canvassed with an ardour and urged with a zeal unexampled in former times, it is matter of astonishment, that the condition of our mercantile marine has hitherto attracted so little attention. The public mind is so irreversibly fixed on the onward march of political improvement, that amid the struggle of opposing interests the real sources of our national prosperity are apt to be overlooked; and accordingly, the Commercial Navy, the very pith and sinews of our exalted power as a nation, is a subject with which extremely few are acquainted. Every day brings us tidings of disastrous losses at sea, involving the destruction of much life and property. It is blindly ascribed to an act of the Almighty, when it is merely the result of a natural cause, producing a natural effect. Vessels are built to be lost, and lost they accordingly are. This may appear paradoxical, but it is not the less true. It proceeds from the unjust and fraudulent system of classifying merchant shipping at Lloyd's. This body of underwriters, from their extensive influence, and the passive torpor of the proprietors of shipping, have been enabled, since 1798, to possess themselves of an extent of control over mercantile matters, to which no other property in the empire is subject, and this vast influence is exercised without the slightest responsibility. The books at Lloyd's form the only records of the national shipping; but unfortunately the plan adopted by this corporation for the management of shipping, is directly opposed to its efficiency. According to the present plan, age is the standard by which it is regulated; and the effect of this is, when a ship has outlived her first character (generally nine years), the owner is compelled to sell her immediately, from the impossibility, in a large portion of our carrying trade, of employing any vessel to whose name the talismanic charm of "A. I." is not appended; for no matter what the merit or real efficiency of a ship be, so long as age is held to be the criterion, the merchants will continue to be governed in their ship-



ments by the practice at Lloyd's, of looking to the *class* and not to the *intrinsic excellence* of the ship. The consequence of this is, to encourage the building of inferior vessels. Many ships are built so hastily—are composed of such inferior or insufficient materials—and are altogether so fragilely constructed—that from the hour they are launched, they are so unfit for the conveyance of dry cargoes, that it is infamous to imperil human life in them; but the builders of such vessels have felt, that for eight or nine years they are quite secure of the first character at Lloyd's, and consequently can, at the inferior prices at which they are enabled to sell them, always find purchasers. Another effect is, where a ship has from *age* lost her first character, the owner in many cases is positively deterred, however much inclined, from repairing her, because if he does so, the estimation of his vessel is not *proportionably* raised, although she may thereby be rendered intrinsically better than many of those ranked in the *first* class. A shipowner reasons thus: "If I repair my ship thoroughly, she will still have the *brand* of a *second-rate* character; if I do not repair her, she will stand with the same *official designation* at Lloyd's." In this manner no reparation, however extensive and complete, can earn for a vessel a better reputation, until, to use a well known phrase, she is run off her legs; and damaged cargoes, foundering ships, and too often a vast loss of valuable lives, sadly testify to the lamentable consequences of this atrocious system. The underwriters at Lloyd's are the chief gainers; for, as has been well observed, were there no losses at sea there would be no sea insurances, and the premiums are always so enormous, that, let the destruction of shipping be what it may, the insurance brokers constantly derive an advantage. An additional aggravation, in a moral point of view, is the encouragement it holds out to fraud, inasmuch as any vessel, however frail, is readily insured for far above her marketable value—is sent to sea—is lost—and the surplus between the actual and nominal value accrues to the owner.

These views are substantiated by the fact, that during the year 1833, upwards of 800 British merchant-vessels have been lost or shipwrecked, between 2 and 3000 valuable lives lost, and more than 1,000,000*l.* worth of merchandise destroyed. During that period scarcely one vessel of the Royal Navy has suffered at sea—because the curse of sea insurance extends not to it, the best and most substantial materials are used, and the most correct and scientific principles of naval architecture are applied to its construction. Is it not truly dreadful to reflect on the condition of our mercantile navy—thrown prostrate under a system which, while it annually consigns to destruction an incalculable amount of capital, deprives the nation of the services of thousands of valuable seamen, and their families of their dependence for support; thereby spreading dismay, want, and misery, into the abodes of a class of men whose value can hardly be overrated, and whose widows and orphans might have continued in the enjoyment of comfort and happiness, had the efficiency of the vessels in which these gallant men perilled their lives, been made a paramount object of national concern? But this gratuitous devastation of life and property is doubly deplorable, from the community deriving no advantage whatever from the sacrifice, inasmuch as the vessels which are sunk occasion a diminution of supply in the merchandise they carried, which increases the price of the remainder, and thus the public, as usual, are compelled to pay for the

loss. It is thus, that the sea insurance-brokers subsist, vampire-like, on the blood of the community, and render it a matter of loud and imperative necessity, that the public mind should awake to this all-important subject; for, irrespective of every other reason, how can the people or the Government hold up their heads and justify such an unconstitutional and infamous law as that of Impressment, while they look idly on at the annual destruction of the very class of men who are the natural guardians of our sea-girt isle, and by the preservation and due protection of whom, such a revolting and despotic measure would be rendered utterly superfluous?

The preceding observations have been suggested by a perusal of two excellent works—the one “On the Classification of Shipping,” by John Marshall, shipowner, London; and the other entitled “The Mercantile Navy Improved,” by James Ballingall, surveyor of shipping, Kirkcaldy.—The former exhibits a luminous view of the proceedings of a committee of the shipowners of London in 1826, towards establishing a better principle of classing merchant shipping, which should operate as a constant stimulus to builders, to construct faithful, well-built vessels, and to owners to keep them in perfect repair; and in order to accomplish this end, to assign to each ship a rank in the registry book, according to her real intrinsic qualities.—By these means the work satisfactorily proves that safety to the crews, protection to the cargoes, and increased durability to the vessels, would be essentially promoted.

Mr. Ballingall's work, besides exposing the same iniquitous mode of classification, is rendered doubly valuable, by exhibiting in clear and intelligible detail (illustrated by drawings) the imperfections of the present system of architecture. He proposes to substitute solid bottoms with caulked ceilings, or inner casing, instead of the present perishable construction, by which only half of the ribs of the hull are united together, and the safety of the vessel and all it contains, are wholly dependent on the outer planking, which, in nine cases out of ten, is shivered to atoms by the slightest contact with a reef or sandbank. By the adoption of this plan, a solid mass of 21 inches of timber would intervene between the interior and the watery element, which, as in the case of the Royal Navy, would be found adequate to resist most contingencies, and even in cases where shipwreck was inevitable, time would generally be afforded for the escape of the crew before such a solid barrier could be destroyed.—We refer to the work itself for more minute details.

Analogous to this subject, we learn that a Society is about to be formed in Liverpool, to insure ships on the same principle that buildings are insured; that is, singly, doubly, and trebly hazardous. Vessels with solid sides and bottoms, as recommended by Mr. Ballingall, to be *singly* hazardous, and charged at the lowest rate of premium. Vessels with the casing inside the ribs, made completely impervious to water, but having the ribs or main timbers open, and which consequently would not oppose the admission of water, to be *doubly* hazardous; and vessels having nothing but the planking *outside* their timbers to exclude water, to be *trebly* hazardous; and in each case, the premium of insurance on the merchandise on board, to be charged in proportion to the risk. The institution of such a Society will certainly prove an in-

ducement to build strong and substantial vessels, and be a great saving to shipowners and the public.

In conclusion let it be remembered, that, to endeavour to elevate the character and thereby extend the employment of the Mercantile Navy, especially at a crisis when the Germanic Confederation is about to narrow the field of our enterprise, by restricting our Baltic trade, and excluding us as far as possible from the Vistula, the Oder, the Elbe, and the Rhine, is not only an object intensely affecting the condition and prosperity of our seafaring population; but, as our Naval Power has been the main instrument of exalting the political and commercial importance of Britain above all other nations, the subject assumes an aspect of intense interest as regards the very existence of the empire itself.

#### ABOLITION OF THE CORN LAWS.

The operatives of England may obtain, under judicious arrangement, either a superior rate of wages, or a reduction in the hours of labour within the limits of the superiority, natural and acquired, which England possesses in supplying manufactured goods for the foreign market. This superiority consists in the greater quantity of work which an Englishman performs in a day or year, and in the greater cheapness of machinery, of fuel, and of carriage; and this superiority is counteracted and limited, by the comparative dearness of food. No plan for improving the condition of the people can by possibility be effectual, unless it increases the quantity of work which can be executed in a day or year, or the comparative cheapness of machinery, fuel, and carriage, or diminishes the comparative dearness of food. All projects for increasing wages, or for diminishing the hours of labour, which do not contain efficient provisions for accomplishing one or more of those objects, are founded in ignorance and in delusion, and must terminate in disappointment, and in aggravated distress. *The first step towards improvement must be the abolition of the Corn Laws.—Colonel Torrens.*

#### BUST OF ANDREW MARVELL.

WE have seen a bust of ANDREW MARVELL, moulded by Mr. Stevens, in composition in imitation of Parian marble. It is very elegant; the imitation of marble is curiously successful, and the substance has a look of purity in keeping with the subject. The likeness is taken from an old print. It is a fine open countenance, with a good deal of mellowness—intellect and enjoyment mingled. Every member of Parliament should have this bust, as a memento of honesty, on his mantel-piece—the bust of Andrew Marvell, the secretary of Milton, the wit, the *incorruptible*—the bust of the last member paid by his constituents, who refused to be bribed by his king. When visited by the emissary of Charles II., he was found lodging up two pair of stairs in a court off the Strand, and the bribe of a thousand guineas being tendered to him, his answer was:—

“My Lord, I regret the trouble you have taken, for I cannot reconcile to my conscience the taking of this money from the King, who is too poor already, from the extravagance of those about him. Give my humble duty to his Majesty, and tell him that I have dined at the tavern in the Strand, for half-a-crown, upon a fine boiled fowl and bacon, with a seasonable garnish of vegetables, and a draught of wine to boot. Tell him that my dinner never exceeds this price; for how could I face my good constituents of Hull, were I to squander the allowance they make me in riotous living, or the modish and frivolous pursuits of the Court? Tell his Majesty, therefore, that the man who can make so good a meal, with a quiet conscience, for half-a-crown a day, would be a rogue indeed, ay, and a fool into the bargain, to accept a bribe of a thousand guineas from e’er a King in Christendom.”—*Examiner.*

## OFFICIAL SEATS IN PARLIAMENT FOR MINISTERS OF THE CROWN.

A SHORT but interesting discussion took place on Thursday, the 1st of May, on a new and important subject—that of permitting Ministers of the Crown to have official seats in Parliament without being elected by any constituents. Sir Robert Heron brought forward his proposition by asking leave to bring in a Bill to prevent the necessity of Members vacating their seats on accepting certain offices: still, however, considering their first admission to the House to be through the election of constituents in the usual way. Mr. E. L. Bulwer moved as an amendment on this—that one organ at least of all the public departments should have a seat in the House by virtue of his office, but without the power of voting, unless elected by some constituency.

We think the defect in each of these propositions to be, that neither of them goes far enough; and the error of both is, that they do not carry out their own principles to their full and legitimate extent. Upon mature reflection, our readers will agree with us in thinking, that the characters of a faithful servant of the Crown and a faithful servant of the People are incompatible with each other; and as it has been truly said, that “No man can serve two masters,” so we feel assured that this case of a Minister endeavouring to serve both King and Constituents, is the strongest illustration of the truth of the maxim. The theory of the British Constitution is, that it consists of three *equally* balanced powers—the King—the Lords—and the Commons. If this were true, the Legislative Assembly (and then there would be no need of *more* than one) ought to consist of an equal number—or equal powers—representing each of these three branches, and the majority of the whole would determine every question brought before it. But instead of this, the King is represented in the House of Commons by his Ministers, and a host of dependent placemen under them—and the Lords are represented in the House of Commons by the many heirs to peerages, and their aristocratical connexions, who sit there; so that these two united, constantly preponderate over the real representatives of the people only. But, though both the higher branches of King and Lords are thus powerfully represented in the Commons, the King has also his representatives in the Lords, and the Lords have their representatives at the Court of the King; but the Commons have no voice or representative in either! To say, therefore, that the Constitution consists of three separate powers all equally balanced against each other, is to evince great ignorance of the real state of the case. The Peers and the King united may at any time defeat the measures of the House of Commons without risk or danger. The Peers and the Commons united may at any time compel the King to accede to their wishes. But though neither the

King nor the Commons can stand up alone against the joint influence of the other two branches, the Peers can stand alone, and defy—as they often have defied—both King, and Commons, and People. Nor shall we ever have the way cleared for good government, till this stumbling-block of hereditary and irresponsible legislation is removed.

The theory of the Constitution assumes also that every Member of the House of Commons is exclusively a representative of the people. But it may be safely asserted that when a Minister accepts office under the Crown, and becomes a servant or representative of the King, from that moment, however he may nominally retain the appellation, he must cease to be a servant or representative of the people. Take the recent case of the Pension List as a striking confirmation of this point. Lord Althorp, Mr. Stanley,\* and their colleagues, admit that the Pension List is not to be defended—that it contains many names on it, which ought not to be there:—they admit that popular opinion demands its revision, and they are aware that they will encounter popular odium by resisting it. But what then? Why this—that they have greater respect for the opinion of the King, their master, who commands them to defend it, than for the people, their constituents, who merely petition for its purgation. They will resign their places rather than give offence to their royal master by disobeying his commands; but they will retain their seats in defiance of their constituents, though they should ever so much reject and despise their prayers. After this, who will say that Ministers can faithfully serve the King, and at the same time truly represent the People?

We would cure this evil by going still further than either Sir Robert Heron or Mr. Bulwer—by going back indeed, to the wholesome, and we doubt not honest and sincere opinions of Lord Althorp himself, before he accepted office, namely—by enacting, that no person holding office under the Crown, and dependent merely on the pleasure of the Crown for the tenure of such office, should hold a seat in Parliament, as one of the representatives of the people at all; but that instead of this, the House should permit such holders of office as might be considered the representatives of the several public departments, to appear in either House of Parliament when required, to explain, and defend, if necessary, the particular measures emanating from their boards, but not to give their votes on such questions, as that is to make them judges in their own cause. It is curious to observe the inconsistencies of public men in this respect. In a civil trial, or a court-martial, no persons are allowed to sit on a jury but those who have no personal interest in the issue; and if such interest can be proved as existing in any individual, that would be deemed good ground of challenge. But in every debate on the measures of Ministers,\* instead of contenting themselves with the defence of these measures, and leaving the verdict on them to be passed by the independent representatives of the people—they muster all their forces, summon all their dependents—and collect all the expectants as well as holders of office, and their friends and connexions—to adjudge their own conduct, and pass votes of approbation on what they themselves have done!

In the debate on this subject, after Sir Robert Heron and Mr. Bulwer had each explained their views, Mr. Ward objected to both, as de-

stroying the link which connected the representatives with the people, and raising an irresponsible *power* in the House: though the object of Mr. Bulwer's motion was to destroy the irresponsible power that already existed there. Doctor Lushington too, said that Mr. Bulwer's was a Tory speech, adapted to the worst Tory times—which shows that the learned Doctor utterly misconceived Mr. Bulwer's object. Lord Althorp admitted that there was a time when he thought no placeman ought to be a representative of the people, but he had since changed his opinion in that respect—though he did not enlighten the House by giving the reasons for such change. To give Ministers, he said, the power of speaking, and not voting, would be to place them in a degrading and unpleasant situation. It might be the latter; but it could not be the former: for in Courts of Law, where learned counsel are the speakers, and the jury are the voters on the questions at issue, the speakers are deemed the more honourable and elevated of the two, and do not by any means consider themselves degraded because they cannot vote also.

The whole subject was so new to the House, however—though the principle of the proposed change has been for some time acted upon in France—and the Members are such dull and slow learners, that it was necessary to give them time to consider the matter somewhat more at leisure, and the original motion and the amendment were therefore both withdrawn.

---

## LORD BROUGHAM'S ATTACK ON MR. O'CONNELL FOR IMPUTED MENDICANCY.

---

IN our last Number we gave a brief expression of our own views on this subject, in the Review of the Debate on the Repeal of the Union, but the question has now assumed a shape that gives it more a general than a personal interest, and demands of us a more detailed exposition. In the debate on the Address, voted by the House of Commons to the King, which was taken up to the Lords for their concurrence, Lord Brougham, in referring to the state of Ireland, is reported to have said:

Was it not lamentable that the country was not allowed to run that race for which Nature had made her capable? And, great God! why was it so? It was *not* that there existed grievances; it was *not* that the people complained; it was *not* that blots existed in the laws—with the exception of one or two insignificant ones, which he hoped, with the assistance of their Lordships, would be speedily razed and obliterated from their books; *not for any of these causes*; but it was because there existed certain individuals, who were gifted by that same nature with great talents—who had improved those talents by assiduity and perseverance—who were possessed of large acquirements, and gifted with the capacity of raising themselves to wealth by honesty and to power by innocent ambition; it was all because those misguided men—as much mistaking their happiness as their honour, and at war with their own interests, as well as with the interests of their fellow subjects, preferred to honest industry, and its creditable and honourable gains, a life of agitation—a life of agitation, supported by a species of personal as well as political mendicancy. (Loud cheers.) A state which, even to the unfortunate victims of such practices, if their natural and honourable feelings were not perverted, must be attended with unbearable shame.

It would seem to us impossible that Lord Brougham could have said this; but for the concurring testimony of all the newspaper reports. But the evidence of its having been said is irresistible. The patriot, Henry Brougham, who for years contended that the people of Ireland were borne down by intolerable grievances—that they, therefore, loudly and justly complained—that there were monstrous blots in the laws—now says that there are *no* grievances—*no* complaints—*no* blots—save some very insignificant ones, which are soon about to be removed! and, to crown all, he accuses Mr. O'Connell of being an Agitator, a character which he, Lord Brougham, of course, never performed; and, above all, of being a Mendicant, because he receives money for service done, and duties performed!

We can hardly trust ourselves to say all that we think and feel on this subject; but we will venture a word or two. Lord Brougham then should recollect, that the whole life of a barrister is one continued sale, not merely of his abilities, but of his opinions, for hire; that whether he is stationary, as when pleading in Westminster Hall, or itinerating, when going the circuit, his palm is open for the fee of the first comer, to prove that A is right and B wrong, or that B is right and A wrong, whoever may happen to retain him first. If Mr. O'Connell be regarded only in this light, as counsel retained for the people of Ireland, to plead whatever they instruct him to plead, and pay him for the same, he is at least equal to Lord Brougham in honesty, as that has been the source of Lord Brougham's income during all his professional life; and there can be no greater criminality in pleading for hire in a court where laws are made, than in a court where laws are administered, since the fountains of justice ought to be equally untainted in both. But barristers appear as counsel before the Houses of Lords and Commons as well as before the Privy Council, every session, to plead whatever they are feed for pleading—to attack corruption, or to defend it, for each is equally easy to them, if the fee be only previously paid. We happen to remember two striking cases in Lord Brougham's own history—one is this. In 1825, his Lordship, then Mr. Brougham, expressed his decided disapprobation of the attempts made in India to suppress the freedom of discussion and destroy the liberty of the press. In 1826, the same Mr. Brougham went up to the Privy Council, and, in conjunction with Mr. Sergeant Spankie, the framer of the obnoxious Indian law, *defended* the Indian Government for this very suppression of all free discussion in India. What was the cause of this change? Only this: that in the interval he had been retained, and received the fee of the East India Company. In 1826, or 1827, he brought forward certain charges of oppression against Lord Charles Somerset, as Governor of the Cape of Good Hope, and threatened to impeach him in the ensuing session if justice were not done in the case. When Parliament met, he was reminded of his threat, and taunted for not carrying it into execution. Why was he deterred from his original purpose? Only because in the interval he had been retained, and feed as a counsel in the case. After this, supposing it to have been true that Mr. O'Connell received fees from Ireland for foregoing all his former opinions, and advocating sentiments the very opposite to those he really entertained, he would be doing no more than Lord Brougham had done before him, and therefore he ought not to be his accuser. But the case of Mr. O'Connell is entirely

different. We have shown plainly enough, in our last, that we do not accord with the opinions of the latter, respecting the Union : and have spoken of him with the same freedom, but with the same justice, as we have endeavoured to do of every other person. We quote, on this occasion, however, the observations of the *Spectator* and *Examiner*, two of the most independent papers in the kingdom, in the truth of which we entirely concur.

It has been remarked by some of the Daily Papers, and indeed it is evident to all men of common discernment, that the allusions made by the Chancellor to the O'Connell tribute were in exceeding bad taste. He charged O'Connell with mendicancy, personal and political. Had O'Connell been himself present and in a situation to retort, we are certain that this topic would have been omitted in the Chancellor's lecture. As it was, it showed considerable powers of countenance to allude to political and personal mendicancy, in the presence of the Dukes of Wellington and Newcastle, whose mothers received pensions for many years from the public—in the presence of Earl Grey, who has quartered a whole tribe of his relatives on the nation, men whose names were never heard of till he became Premier—in the presence of Lord Ellenborough, whose enormous sinecure income is a disgrace to the man who pockets it, and the Government which sanctioned its existence—in the presence of a whole host of pensioned aristocrats who never have performed a single action to redeem their names from merited obscurity. The pensions of all these people are paid out of the produce of the taxes, some of which are wrung from the necessities of the poorest classes; and yet the useless recipients of these sums consider themselves entitled to sneer at O'Connell, because his income is derived from the voluntary contributions of his admiring countrymen. It is easy to assert that O'Connell pursues the game of agitation for the sake of the money it brings him. It is equally easy to assert, and as difficult to prove, that Lord Brougham attached himself to the Whig party for the sake of pelf and power, flattery and patronage; that his motives are not patriotic, but thoroughly selfish; that he made his democratic speeches a stepping-stone to place merely; and that his sole aim through life has been his own glorification. His income and that of O'Connell are both derived from the same source, the pockets of the people; but one is paid willingly, the other through the agency of the tax-gatherer. Which mode is the more honourable to the receiver?—*Spectator*.

Mr. O'Connell has abandoned large professional emoluments to devote himself to the cause of the people of Ireland—the yearly contribution, the rent, is the price of such services. Whether what are called his services deserve the name or not, is immaterial to the present question—the Irish people deem them services, and when requiring what they deem services, it cannot be said that they bestow charity. There is no mendicancy in Mr. O'Connell's case. He gives his talents to his country, and a grateful price is paid for them. The wisdom of both applications, of the talents on the one hand and the money on the other, is fairly open to dispute; but supposing the Irish to be in the grossest error in estimating the labours of Mr. O'Connell as they do, he is not a mendicant for receiving the price for them. An advocate is not a beggar because his client has judiciously paid him a retaining fee.

Andrew Marvell was supported by the contributions of his constituents at Hull. And would the Lord Chancellor insult the memory of that virtuous man, by describing his condition as one of mendicancy? Mr. O'Connell has a nation for his constituents. He is paid by willing hands for supposed services. The Lord Chancellor is paid by grudging hands, through the tax-gatherer.

There is much of false sentiment mixed up with the consideration of this matter—we hear fine clap-traps of scorn for the man who pockets the mite wrung from the hard hands of peasants; but do no mite, wrung from the hard hands of peasants, go to the pensioners, the "valiant beggar," and the servants of the State? A man who, for no services real or imagined, receives a large share of the public money, lives in a state reputed honourable; while the shame of mendicancy is imputed to another, whose labours are voluntarily remunerated by a



grateful people. The money extorted from the public, and applied odiously to it, carries no disgrace; but a fund raised by a people, by self-taxation, is accounted infamous.

We avow that, notwithstanding the scorn cast upon a stipendiary member, we wish there were in the House of Commons some dozen of Andrew Marvells, men of talent and probity, enabled by the contributions of constituencies to devote themselves to public business. Sure we are that the bargain would be profitable to the people. Better instructed statesmen would be produced by it. Lord Brougham, indeed, has told us, that there is nothing in the most active professional or commercial employment incompatible with the functions of a statesman; but we have always doubted, whether information and mature reflection upon intricate or profound political problems rushed into a man's mind between his dinner and his walk or drive to the House of Commons. Supposing some preparation to be necessary for the business of Parliament, some leisure from money-getting occupations must be necessary for it; and the question is, how such time, with such application, can be had. There are men of leisure and ability in the independent and affluent classes, but they serve on their own terms; and, accustomed to ease, application of a strict kind is generally irksome to them. But the people have not yet learnt the qualifications which they should require in a statesman. A rich man, who will do *no harm*, is a paragon!—*Examiner*.

While quoting from others, we may be permitted, perhaps, to revert back a little, to quote from ourselves, and to show that long before we entered Parliament, and, indeed, before the Reform Bill, which opened that House more freely to the friends of the people, was passed, we entertained very similar sentiments to those here expressed, which sentiments have gained great strength by experience, and are entertained by us at the present moment as fully as when they were first written. We will not give the exact words, but merely state that, several years since, in a small work on Taxation, and in a section of that work relating to the adoption of the vote by ballot, and the reciprocal duties of members and constituents, we ventured to point out the singular absurdity, and the inevitable ill consequences, of appointing Legislators to perform gratuitous services, and thereby giving them continual excuses for neglect, while in every other department of labour, from the menial servant to the prime minister, the best security for attentive discharge of duty, is found to be a competent reward for diligence and fidelity, and a sufficient consideration to render it worth their while to abandon all other pursuits, and adhere to the only occupation to which their whole time and talents are devoted. By the present system, however, of unpaid Representatives, none but the enthusiast is ever likely to give his long or steady attention to the interests of the people; and his enthusiasm is in perpetual danger of abatement from the difficulties with which he is surrounded; while the calls of more profitable business lead to neglect in some, and the hope of advancement through ministerial patronage, leads to subserviency in others; the result of the whole being this: that they who neglect their Parliamentary duties and attend to their own private affairs, are rewarded by the profit of their business and pursuits; and they who attend, but give their whole strength to Ministers rather than their constituents, are rewarded by ministerial patronage and favour; while the honest and faithful Member who attends early and late, and votes for the interests of his constituents and the people at large, finds a falling off in his profits from business, gains nothing whatever from his opposition to Ministers, and is equally uncompensated for his sacrifices by those to whose interests he devotes himself entirely.

We have heard that some notion is entertained of Members being paid for their attendance on Committees, and having emoluments in some other way. We can declare most solemnly, that not a shilling is allowed to any Member for any attendance he may give at any time, or in any place; though barristers attending four or five Committees a day are paid five and ten guineas for each, and will pocket 20*l.* in a morning before the heavy nightwork of the Member begins—though the Speaker receives 6000*l.* a year, with a splendid house and establishment—though the Ministers have each their 5000*l.* and 4000*l.*; and so on:—and even the Clerks at the Table have their 2500*l.*, 2000*l.* and 1500*l.* a year; and the door-keepers little short of 1000*l.*—The Member, however, who, faithful to his duty, labours as many hours, and as severely, as any of those that are named,—is obliged, in addition to the disadvantage of receiving no remuneration whatever for what others are so liberally paid for—to give up his whole time and attention to public affairs. If he does not do this, he is not so efficient or so faithful a Member as it is desirable he should be: and yet instead of being rewarded for his labours he is actually subjected, in his various *additional* and unavoidable expenses, which would not be incurred but for his seat in Parliament, and his necessary maintenance of his position as such, to at least 500*l.* in each session, which would be an almost insensible burden if spread over a large constituency, but falls heavily on the shoulders of any single individual.

We believe, therefore, the time is fast approaching when, if such Members as Andrew Marvell are required for Representatives, they must be secured as Andrew Marvell was—and as every other description of zealous and faithful servant is still secured—by an open, honourable, and adequate payment of a fair and just compensation, that shall reflect credit on both giver and receiver: instead of the present system under which the wages of corruption are given and received without a blush, and too often deemed honourable in both; while the well-earned tribute of honest merit, paid by a free and willing people, is stigmatized as unworthy of both.

#### REASONS WHY WAGES DO NOT RISE.

Upon general principles, the great superiority in the efficacy of British labour, aided, as it is, by better machinery, cheaper fuel, and cheaper carriage, should give an extensive margin, enabling the operatives of England to obtain a considerable increase of wages above those of their continental brethren, without depriving the British manufacturer of his superiority in the foreign market, or exposing him to the danger of foreign competition. But we find, by the evidence given before the Committee of the Session of 1833, that the British manufacturer is already standing upon that extreme and dangerous verge, beyond which his foreign rival can encounter him upon equal terms; and that an increase of wages, relatively to the wages obtained upon the continent, would deprive him of his footing in the foreign market. What then is the counteracting circumstance which takes from the operative classes of England the power of obtaining an increase of wages, within the limits of the great superiority in the efficacy of their labour arising from the extraordinary advantages, natural and acquired, which they possess? This counteracting circumstance is the high price of food; and the cause of the high price of food, is the existing Corn Laws. A very brief illustration will be sufficient to demonstrate, that while the price of corn in England remains nearly twice as high as upon the continent, it is morally impossible for the English operative to obtain either an increase of wages, or a diminution in the hours of his toil.—*Colonel Torrens.*

## DEBATE ON MR. HARVEY'S MOTION FOR A REVISION OF THE PENSION LIST.

THIS debate, which took place on Monday, the 5th of May, was one of the most animated of the Session. It was well known that a private meeting of the friends of Ministers had taken place at the Treasury, in Downing Street, to concert measures for resisting the motion with all the force the Government could bring against it: and it was also known that a private meeting had taken place in one of the Committee Rooms of the House of Commons, to concert a middle course, of which Mr. Strutt was to be the mover, and Mr. Romilly the seconder, so that a sharp debate was sure to arise. This occasioned the House to be filled at a very early hour, there being not less, perhaps, than 500 Members present in the body of the House, and in the galleries, as early as half-past five o'clock. An arrangement having been made to give Mr. Harvey's motion precedence over the Orders of the Day, he began his opening speech about a quarter before six, and continued till about eight o'clock. He complained of ill health, and was at first somewhat feeble; but as he proceeded, his usual energy returned, and his whole speech was much and deservedly applauded. After recapitulating the history of the previous proceedings on this subject, he came to the pith and marrow of the whole question, namely, the impurity of the Pension List—the resistance of every attempt to have it investigated, and the necessity for this being done at the present moment. He said:—

Now he would be content to reduce his motion to this question,—had that list in any one particular ever been investigated? (Cheers.) There were several hon. gentlemen present who had sat upon the committee, and he would ask them if the pension list, either in its details or its aggregate, formed any part of their inquiry? (Hear.) It was impossible! He maintained it was impossible, for although the body that investigated that list might have been a partial one,—though the recipients of the public or royal bounty might have had many friends upon it, yet it could not be supposed that there had been the slightest attempt at investigation, or else it must most assuredly have led to some reduction in the list, however small that reduction might be. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, because the list remained unimpaired in all its hideousness, because there had not been one farthing of money saved to the people, he had a right to conclude that the list had not been investigated. (Cheers.) He would then call upon the house if the list, though it had been prospectively diminished, yet had not undergone revision. He would call upon them and ask them if they were prepared—they, members of the first House of Commons which had been returned by the agency of the people—were they prepared to oppose the investigation of this odious list, and to do this under the imputation of being alarmed by a treaty, or menaced by a threat? (Cheers.) They were told that inquiry, however proposed, in whatsoever form (he was not curious about the form), would be opposed by this Government, which might be considered as a distillation of the purity of Whiggery. (Loud laughter.) They were, it was said, determined to stake their importance—they were content to have their greatness read in future histories as connected with their magnanimous defence of that pension list, which ought to have excited

the abhorrence of every honest man that ever looked at it. They, members of a reformed administration—the authors of the measure of reform—were minded to signalize themselves as the champions of a list which all men should condemn. They were ready to risk all the reputation they had won. They were disposed to sacrifice all those prospects of benefit to the country which, from their position, they might have hoped to be enabled to bestow. All this they were ready, disposed, content, willing, determined, to do, that they might enjoy the unutterable honour of coming forward in that house as the defenders and apologists of a list in which it would be difficult to put the finger upon any one name which would not invite suspicion. (Loud cheers)

(On a former occasion he recollected a motion such as this had been resisted by the hon. Secretary of the Treasury, upon the grounds that the task it proposed for hon. members would be a disgusting occupation—that it was a service such as no man would, if possible, encounter, and from which every delicate sentiment must shrink. (Hear, hear.) Certainly this, it must be allowed, was no very high compliment to the persons upon this list, many of whom were nevertheless members of the fairest and proudest families in the country. (Cheers and laughter.) No high compliment undoubtedly, when he insisted that an investigation of the claims, in virtue of which they enjoyed their pensions, would excite in the breasts of those to whom the duty was intrusted such shuddering sentiments of abhorrence, as could not be controlled, or disguised, or endured. (Cheers.) Well, this difficulty might have existed on a former occasion, but it was now obviated by the terms of the present motion. He thought that the house ought to present an address to His Majesty, as the fountain of all favour, inviting him to investigate the pension list. That was the object of his motion, and he thought that no course would be more acceptable to the party addressed, or to those whose duty it was to give responsible advice to the Crown; indeed, he was inclined to believe that the threatened opposition was merely an affected sentiment of delicacy on the part of Ministers, and that in reality they would be well pleased that the pension list should be investigated, in order that all their past pledges and promises might be realized. (Hear, hear.) If, upon examination, it should be found that any of the pensions charged upon the consolidated fund were improperly granted, and ought to be withdrawn, the money thus released would not be at the disposal of either the King or his Ministers, but would form a fund for the benefit of the people. How stood the matter? 75,000*l.* were given in the civil list to be appropriated as the King thought fit, subject to the control of the house; and the remainder was placed on the consolidated fund, with the understanding, that as the parties receiving the pensions should drop off, the amount of their respective pensions should be brought into the general public treasury.

It appeared to him absurd to contend that the King was bound to retain upon the list all persons who stood upon it at the time the last arrangement was made with respect to pensions. He was the more disposed to come to this conclusion, because it was impossible for any one to run his eye through the list without being struck with the defective titles of some of those who figured there. He was aware that it might be considered an injudicious course to refer to particular names—he did not mean injudicious as regarded the effect which it would produce elsewhere, but injudicious inasmuch as it was calculated to produce a division of discussion, because he knew that it was scarcely possible to name any one individual out of all those who pocketed the 130,000*l.* a-year, in whose favour one hon. member at least would not start up and say “that though he was not the general advocate of the civil list, and though he objected to the principle upon which it was defended, yet as far as regarded the individual whose name had been uncourteously introduced, if there was one man who of all others ought to be upon the list, he was that one.” (Cheers and laughter.) Then the house would be entertained with sketches of family history, such as had been furnished upon a former occasion respecting the two Misses Gossett. He was perfectly aware that by referring to particular names upon the pension list he should afford an opportunity for the introduction of such drivelling details as he had alluded to; but he would run the risk, in order to show the extreme anxiety which prevailed in the public mind upon this subject, not on account of the amount paid for pen-

sions, but because of the principle involved in the question. Gentlemen in the house, who formed a community—a sort of little world of their own, and who knew scarcely any thing beyond what passed in that house and Downing-street, might be indifferent to what the country thought whilst they continued to serve the Government. He could, however, venture to inform Ministers that a deep and intense feeling pervaded the community, both intellectually and numerically, with respect to this question.

The Government had lately propounded a measure for the alteration of the poor laws, one of the provisions of which was, that after a given day no person should be a recipient of parochial relief, even although, as to the length of time in which he had been in the habit of receiving it, he might almost run a race with some of the most venerable names upon the pension list. (A laugh.) No sympathy was shown for the vested rights of the poor; no, that was reserved exclusively for honourable duchesses, and for the flitting shadows of fashion. It was a disgrace to every man in the country who had wealth at command to allow the name of a relative to stand upon the pension list. (Hear, hear.) We had laws by which a son or a grandson could be compelled, if he should forget the everlasting obligation of nature, to support those who reared and protected them in helpless childhood. Why should not the same principle be applied to the persons on the pension list and their relatives? There might be upon that list individuals who, when first placed there, were objects of compassion, but who had grown into opulence by the accident of connexion on the better fortune of their associates, and in such cases as these the advantage of his address was apparent, because it would afford an opportunity for those quiet, delicate communications, which would carry a charm with them, inasmuch as they would proceed from royalty. A hint from such a quarter would produce a greater effect than the strongest resolution of a committee. He had no doubt that when the tree on which so much rotten fruit hung should be shaken by a royal hand, very little would be left worth any one's gathering. (Cheers and laughter.) He proposed, however, to show the anxiety which prevailed on this subject throughout the country, to read a few of the names which had been pointed out to him from various quarters, with the accompanying remarks thereupon. He could assure the house that this subject had been no sinecure to him, either with reference to the number of dull speeches which he had been compelled to wade through, or the communications which had poured in upon him from all quarters, and which he had been compelled to answer. The hon. member then read the following statement and list:

“The following list will enumerate some of the favoured enjoying pensions who are pluralists, by holding situations under Government. It will designate many who have never performed any public services, and consequently obtained their emoluments from Court or Ministerial patronage. It will also point out those whose pensions should have ceased when otherwise provided for by marriage or inheritance. The noblesse, whose poverty has arisen from their forefathers' extravagance, may claim assistance from their own order, but can have no right to be quartered on the revenues of the country.

“Lord Aylmer's pension is 356*l.* per annum. He is Captain-General of Canada (some thousands a-year), and colonel of the 18th Foot.” Now, he asked whether that was true? He wished for an answer “ay” or “no.” A word from His Majesty would stop this pension.

“Lord Aston has good church preferment, besides a good private fortune.” Was that true? His lordship's pension was very small; but then it was the more contemptible in him to receive it. (Hear, hear.) Nothing, however, was too small for the pensioners to grasp at. Some persons in the list received in dribblets five or six pensions of 50*l.* Such persons were always at the elbow of the minister or the monarch, and their importunities were not unfrequently bought off by a pension. Lord Aston condescended to receive 97*l.* out of the labour of the working classes. (Hear, hear.)

“Lord Auckland is Master of the Mint, President of the Board of Trade, and Commissioner of Greenwich Hospital; his pension is 300*l.* per annum, which he ~~has~~ whilst holding his present offices.” Lord Auckland did not receive his

pension whilst he was in office, and he wished that principle to be applied to all pension-receivers. If they derived a good income from other sources they ought not to receive their pensions. He would not then stop to ask what was done with the amount of Lord Auckland's pension whilst it was in abeyance, but he did not recollect that any reduction was made from the last grant on that account. ("Hear," and a laugh.)

"Sir John de Blaquiere enjoys a pension of 1072*l.*, and again as baron of 893*l.* 13*s.*" This was a monstrous case. Sir John received his first pension in 1794, and having served an apprenticeship of eight years, he was raised to the peerage and received 893*l.* 13*s.* a-year more. (Hear, hear.)

"Lord Bloomfield is Colonel of a battalion of artillery, and has 936*l.* 16*s.* per annum." No doubt a whole host of members would rise in their places to eulogize this noble lord, and to express their regret that he had not received some more solemn and substantial mark of his country's approbation.

"Charles Oldfield Bowles, and Elizabeth, his wife, have a pension of 192*l.* He was a private secretary to Mr. Goulburn for a short time. (Hear, hear.) He is Colonel of the Oxford Militia, from possessing a large property in the county." He supposed the right hon. member for the University of Cambridge would by-and-bye favour the house with a biographical sketch of this happy couple. (A laugh.) It would be observed that he mentioned the names of no persons who were not likely to have some friend in the house to speak on their behalf.

"Sir Henry Browne has 200*l.* per annum, and 200*l.* more as Thomas Henry Browne. He is on half-pay of the 23d Foot. His rewarded services consisted in having been the aide-de-camp to the present Lord Londonderry ("hear," and a laugh) when Ambassador at Vienna, and was sent to Milan on the delicate mission of gaining information relative to the conduct of Queen Caroline." (Hear, hear.) He never before knew the value of a title; but it was clear that the being made a "Sir" was worth 200*l.* a-year to Mr. Browne. He was desirous to refer any person who wished to know how well this gentleman had earned his pension to the trial of the late Queen.

"The Earl of Cavan has a regiment, and is a governor besides. He has 266*l.* a-year.

"The Baroness Cathcart, wife of Lord Cathcart (he is Colonel of the 2d Regiment of Life Guards, 1800*l.* per annum; and a retiring pension from having been Ambassador and Governor of Hull) enjoys a pension.

"Dowager Lady Clare has 780*l.*, the widow of the rich ex-Chancellor.

"The Marchioness of Carmarthen, 700*l.* Her husband is heir to the Dukedom of Leeds.

"Marianna Cockburn, sister to Viscount Hereford, 115*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.*; is the wife of Sir James Cockburn, who has 1000*l.* per annum as Inspector of Marines. She and her four sisters had pensions granted of 115*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* when young, but it never was contemplated that on their marriage these pensions should continue." This was a case which came within the principle he had laid down, that pensions should be superseded on the success of the receivers of them in other departments. (A laugh.)

"Juliana Maria Eyre is another sister, a widow, with a good jointure of 600*l.* a-year.

"Georgiana Maria Gwynne, another sister.

"Charlotte Wellington, another sister; and

"Catherine Eliza Wilkins, the fifth married sister, lately married (from her widowhood) to R. Stretton, Esq., high sheriff this year for Breconshire; her former husband left her 2000*l.* a-year jointure.

"Lord Elphinstone has 138*l.*; also 276*l.* 10*s.*, and again 138*l.*

"Eliza Mackenzie and Ruth Elphinstone, 276*l.* 10*s.*

"The Eden family have 407*l.* per annum.

"Mary Gwynne, if the widow of General Gwynne, has a pension; she besides receives 400*l.* pension.

"Earl Howe is too wealthy a nobleman to receive 2½6*l.* per annum. 'This is too bad.'

"Viscount Hereford receives 115*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.*, which was granted to him at the same time as similar annuities were to his five sisters. What makes his case more glaring is, that he inherits also his father's pension of 467*l.* He has two seats in Wales, Fregoyd and Nancribba, and lately bought of the Crown a manor adjoining the town of Hay, thereby extending his own grouse manor.

"Thomas Knox Holmes (hear, hear), 500*l.*" This was the only case in which the paper he was reading from stated the consideration for which the pension was granted. It was stated to be given to Mr. Holmes as the son of the whipper-in of the late Administration (a laugh), and he (Mr. Harvey) could honestly say that a more faithful whipper-in Government never had. (A laugh.)

"Sir Herbert Taylor is the Colonel of the 85th Regiment, notwithstanding he has 930*l.* pension.

"Sir William Johnston, 714*l.* per annum : a rich baronet.

"Lieutenant-General Knollis, 400*l.* per annum ; he receives besides a lieutenant-general's pay, and is also Governor of Limerick." (A member on the Treasury bench said, 'He is dead.') 'That,' rejoined Mr. Harvey, 'is the best thing that can be said of him.' (A laugh.)

"The Rev. William Kuper, 400*l.* 15*s.* ; a chaplain to the German Chapel.

"Dame Fanny Lushington, 350*l.* per annum, and the Hon. Ann Lushington, 624*l.* per annum, and her four children. A governorship in India ought to satisfy the Lushington family, who have enjoyed good situations for so many years.

"George Leigh, and Mary his wife, 700*l.* ; he was a personal friend of the late King, and commanded the 10th Light Dragoons. This is a pension *extra-ordinaire*.

"The Earl of Minto, an ambassador, 924*l.*

"Lady Louisa Murray." Of this lady he would say nothing, because her husband had just been successful in another place. (Cheers and laughter.)

"Lord Montford, 467*l.* ; ditto, 155*l.* "

"Lord Strangford condescends to take a pension of 85*l.* (Hear, hear.) He has the retiring pension of an ambassador, 2000*l.* per annum ; Maria, Dowager Strangford has a pension of 233*l.* ; ditto, 266*l.*

"Lady Ann Culling Smith, 600*l.* Sister to the Duke of Wellington ; her husband a rich man.

"Sir Simeon Stuart, 200*l.* A rich baronet, who never performed any public service.

"Lieutenant-Colonel Meyrick Shaw, 500*l.* ; ditto, 499*l.* He was a private secretary to the Marquis Wellesley in India, and also in Ireland. One pension would be adequate. He is now employed again.

"The Earl of Tyrconnel, 600*l.* ; ditto, 445*l.* He married Miss Crowe, of Kiplin-park, Yorkshire, a very rich heiress. (Hear, hear.)

"Thomas Lord Walsingham, a dignitary of Winchester Cathedral ; he has 636*l.* per annum.

"Lady Matilda Wynyard, 437*l.* ; the wife of General Wynyard.

"Sir F. Watson, 936*l.*

"Emily Marchioness of Westmeath, sister of the Marquis of Salisbury and wife of the Marquis of Westmeath ; cannot expect to be supported by the public. She has 386*l.* per annum.

"The Rev. Alexander Sterkey, the Swiss Minister, 400*l.* 15*s.*"

After an eloquent peroration, in which he warned the Ministers of the popular odium they would incur by resisting this motion ; and an appeal to the House not to be carried away by the alarm of not finding adequate talent to conduct the affairs of the country, if any of the present members of the administration thought fit to resign—he concluded by moving as follows :

"That an humble Address be presented to his Majesty, that he will be graciously pleased to direct inquiry to be made into the consideration of each Pension, as it appears in the List ordered to be printed by his faithful Commons, on the 28th of August, 1833, with a view to be assured, that such persons only are in the receipt of the public money, as have just claims on the royal beneficence, or who by their personal services to the crown, by their performance of duties to the public, or by their useful discoveries in science, and attainments in literature and the arts, have merited the gracious consideration of their sovereign, and the gratitude of their country."

Lord Althorp opposed the motion on these two grounds: first, that it was a compact settled between the King and his Parliament, that the existing pensions should be confined to the receivers during his Majesty's lifetime; and that it would be, therefore, dishonourable in his Ministers to sanction such breach of faith, as any alteration in that list would imply: and, secondly, that having already pledged the House, by the resolution of February 18, to apply certain rules to all future pensions to be granted, the past was by that implied to be irrevocably settled.

Mr. Strutt moved an amendment of a most singular nature; it was for referring the whole of the Pension List to a Select Committee, with power to expose and make public any abuses in the grants, but with no power to alter or amend such abuses, beyond mere exposure; and in the speech which he delivered, he spoke of the pensions now enjoyed, as "vested rights," as sacred as any private fortune, however honourably acquired. His amendment was as follows:

"That a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire into the Pensions charged on the Civil List, and on the Consolidated Fund, in order to ascertain the nature and extent of any abuses which may have occurred in the granting of the said Pensions, with a view of giving full effect to the Resolutions of this House of the 18th of February last."

Lord Althorp objected to this amendment even still more strongly than to the original motion, and said, that whatever might be the obloquy, and whatever the consequences involved, he should strenuously resist both.

Mr. Hume and Mr. Jervis both advocated the original motion; Mr. Bynge opposed it, and Mr. Hawkins supported Mr. Strutt's amendment.

Sir Robert Peel came in to give his powerful and timely aid to the Ministers, and it was impossible not to remark on the smiling countenances by which those on the Treasury benches hailed his accession to their cause. He demolished, in the most triumphant manner, the utter uselessness of such an amendment as that of Mr. Strutt, to expose, but not to amend; to inflict pain and disgrace, but not to apply a cure; and he concluded his address by the following pathetic lamentation over the loss of those sweets of office which were attempted by modern reformers to be swept away for ever.

The house was to vote an address to the Crown or a select committee to institute an inquiry into the merits of pensions. The object should be to introduce useful reformation; but he utterly denied that the Tory Ministers had used the pension list as the means of rewarding persons improperly. But the house was going to dry up the source of reward for all services, and what it seemed to be doing was to see by what means public men might be invited into the public service at the least possible expense, and to prevent public men deriving any of those advantages from office which, in former times, were considered a compensation for the labour and anxieties of office. He (Sir R. Peel) trusted they might be able to invite great talents into the public service with this economy of



expense; he wished he could believe that such men would be ready to make a disinterested tender of their services, and devote their lives to the public. But that was quite a different question. He (Sir R. Peel) contended that the pension list thus appropriated, was a reward for public services. (Hear.) Review the history of public men who had filled office for the last twenty years. Begin with Mr. Fox. How long did Mr. Fox serve as a minister of the Crown before he died in office? Mr. Pitt followed, and he was cut off in the prime of life by the toils and anxieties of office. (Hear.) Mr. Pitt was succeeded by Mr. Perceval, who fell by the hand of an assassin. Mr. Perceval was succeeded by Lord Castlereagh, whose untimely fate was as much brought on by the devotion of his powers to the service of his country, as if he had been led out to execution. (Hear, hear.) When the house recollected these splendid examples, he asked them whether they thought it decent that the families of such men should be pointed at, and held up to public scorn? According to the construction of the compact between the King and Parliament, the house was concluded as to the sum appropriated to the pension list; and if it had changed its sentiments on this point, he entreated them not to make the character of these men and their friends victims of its new opinions. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Sheil supported Mr. Harvey's motion. Mr. Lloyd advocated Mr. Strutt's amendment; and Mr. Rotch proposed a new one of his own, to the effect that the existing pensions should be taken from all those who already had, from other sources, sufficient to support themselves. Mr. Rotch apologised for his troubling the House by saying, that he was absent from the debate through illness on the last occasion: and having received a significant hint from his constituents, that though illness might be a good excuse for once, it would not do a second time, he was now speaking for his constituents rather than to the House.

Mr. Stanley ridiculed most successfully the speech of Mr. Rotch, though the objection to his proposed amendment was not so powerful; and, after dwelling at great length on the solemn compact made with the Crown, which indeed was the only argument used against submitting the Pension List to a revision, he concluded by saying,

The hon. member had told them that ministers had lost the confidence of the country. Why, if it was so—if ministers had lost the confidence of the country—the sooner the present administration retired from office the better. He readily admitted that men might be certainly found in the country—and in that house, men of great intelligence, and great talent—who were more fit than the present ministers, to conduct the affairs of the country, to the satisfaction of the hon. member (a laugh); but he would venture to say, that no Parliament would ever so far despise public honour as to sanction the hon. member's amendment, and no minister would be bold enough or base enough to insult the Crown by recommending that the sovereign should break his plighted word. (Cheers.)

Mr. O'Connell made a short, but satisfactory answer to the argument of vested rights and plighted honour, which were shown to be most fallacious: and Mr. Harvey concluded the debate by the following reply:

Mr. D. W. HARVEY, in reply, declared his determination to take the sense of the house on the original question, in order to give hon. members an opportunity of declaring their opinions on its substantive merits; but if that were not carried, he should vote for the amendment. The right hon. Secretary for the Colonies had told the house that the success of the motion would be the signal for his retreat from office, accompanied by the whole body of his colleagues. But the house ought to know that even if the present Ministry did retire from office, the country would not be left without an administration. There were two Cabinets in that house, two sets of Ministers, for whatever the present Ministers might think of their own authority, the real governor of the country, was the right hon.

member for Tamworth. (Loud cheers and laughter.) No hen was ever more solicitous to gather her chickens under her wing (loud laughter) than they were to catch at his support, and the sunshine of gratification never visited their once blooming countenances, until it was known to what port and to what point the right hon. gentleman had set sail. (Continued laughter.) Not that this was often a point of much solicitude with them; their conduct generally must have insured his approbation. ("Hear," and laughter.) We had had some strikes lately: there had been a strike amongst the tailors (much laughter), and it looked as if there was a strike in the Cabinet. (Loud and continued laughter.) He had no doubt, however, that the Cabinet would experience as much comfort as the master tailors, who, in the absence of men, now found that old women would do just as well. (Bursts of laughter, repeatedly renewed.) He would now turn to the speech of the hon. member who proposed the amendment on his motion. He thought that the hon. member had taken too high a tone (hear, hear), when he said that he as an honest man could not vote for the motion. But though he disliked his speech, he liked the interpretation his amendment would bear.

It was said—and it was meant as an extinguisher to his motion—that the claims to these pensions were vested rights, and ought to be guarded with as much sacredness as private property. Now, would any one pretend to say that the landed property of the gentry of England was worth as much and no more in point of title, and would therefore fetch as much and no more in the market? Few lawyers had taken part in this discussion—indeed, he believed only one besides himself; but he was ready to answer in their behalf that no man taking the purchase of such a pension to any conveyancer in Lincoln's-inn, and directing deeds of assignment to be drawn, would find the security the same. He knew many instances where the opinion of counsel had been taken respecting the purchase of such pensions, and the answer had uniformly been, "Use your own discretion, because the pension must determine at the demise of the Crown." (Hear, hear.) He knew several instances where these pensions had been sold, and in consequence of these circumstances were sold, instead of 14 or 16, for two years' purchase (hear); but ~~it~~ was really curious to see how delicately Ministers had dealt with the Crown. They wished to make his Majesty nothing more than grand registrar of pensions, without the power of revocation. Now suppose his Majesty had taken all the individuals whose names were on the pension list, and at once erased their names; supposing too a complaint had been lodged by these individuals at the bar of the House, against what they would or might call a crying act of injustice; would it not have been scouted by the house as a most outrageous attack on the privileges of the Crown? If the house was not now to interfere, when would they have the power? According to the doctrines broached, if there were to be a demise of the Crown to-morrow, these vested rights would still continue. The pension list would always be full, and thus all the means of purifying it would be denied them. He should now read an extract from a speech made some years ago by the right honourable baronet the First Lord of the Admiralty; who, when he supported that pillar (continued the hon. gentleman, turning round and directing his eye towards one of the pillars of the gallery on the Opposition side of the house), made a series of motions on this subject that would for ever fix his fame, and he quoted it not only because the authority of the speaker was entitled to great respect, but because it exactly coincided with his (Mr. Harvey's) views, and was remarkably applicable to the subject under discussion.

The extract was from Sir James Graham's speech, on a motion for a Return of the Pensions enjoyed by Privy Councillors, when he was a Member of the Whig Opposition; and in a case far less flagrant than the Pension List now sought to be removed, Sir James used all those very arguments for revision, which the present Ministers, by whom he was then supported, now so stoutly resisted. But this endeavour to shame the present Ministers into virtue, by reading to them the professions made by their own tongues in other days, has now been so

often repeated, that it fails to produce the requisite effect; and they bear the exposition of their own inconsistencies with wonderful magnanimity.

On the division that took place, there were—For Mr. Harvey's original motion, 148; Against it, 390—For Mr. Strutt's amendment, 230; Against it, 311—there being in the House on the first division, 538—and in the second, 541 Members; and there being also 82 who voted for Mr. Strutt's amendment that would not vote for Mr. Harvey's original motion. The division upon the first question, which comprises all those who wish to see the existing Pension List revised, and justice done to the King and the country, by purging it of its present impurities, will be found in its proper place.

It will not escape observation, however, that on this, as well as on many other occasions, the Ministers have been kept in their places by the Tories, and the Tories only, who are sufficiently powerful in the House of Commons to hold the balance between the Whigs and the Liberals: and who, by allying themselves with either, can defeat the other party: while in the House of Lords, where there are no Liberals to keep in check—unless, indeed, Lord Durham and Lord Denman be considered of that order—for Lords Grey, Lansdowne, Holland, and Brougham, have long since ceased to be reckoned among them—the Tories have the ascendant so completely, that it is in their power, at any time when they deem the moment most fitting, to turn out the present Government, and occupy their places. What would soon follow such a change, it is not difficult to foresee. They would be either compelled to be more liberal than the present Government, or give way to others; and, in truth, the fermentation of public opinion on the great subjects of the abolition of the Corn Laws—the Repeal of the Union between Church and State—the return to Triennial Parliaments—the revision of Taxation, and the adjustment of the National Debt—or the adaptation of the Currency to the weight of its burdens—is such, that we must either have a Ministry that will grapple with these questions manfully and fairly, or go on through this transition state, changing, and purifying, and liberalizing, every successive Administration, until the Government is firmly established on the broad foundations of popular approbation and general content.

#### THE DOCTRINE OF PASSIVE OBEDIENCE TESTED BY ITS INFLUENCE ON THE HAPPINESS OF SOCIETY.

ON principles of reason, the only way to determine the agreement of any thing with the will of God, is to consider its influence on the happiness of society; so that, in this view, the question of passive obedience is reduced to a simple issue. Is it best for the human race that every tyrant and usurper be submitted to without check or control? It ought to be remembered, that if the doctrine of passive obedience be true, princes should be taught it, and instructed, that to whatever excesses of cruelty and caprice they proceed, they may expect no resistance on the part of the people. If this maxim appear to be conducive to general good, we may fairly presume it concurs with the will of the Deity; but if it appear pregnant with the most mischievous consequences, it must disclaim such support. From the known perfection of God, we conclude he wills the happiness of mankind, and that though he condescends not to interpose miraculously, that kind of civil policy is most pleasing in his eye, which is productive of the greatest felicity.—*Robert Hall.*

## PERPETUATION OF TITHES IN IRELAND AS A FIXED CHARGE ON THE LAND.

A VERY important debate took place on Tuesday evening, the 7th of May, on the Second Reading of the Bill for Commutation of Tithes in Ireland, which gave rise to some very curious scenes. We cannot do better than give the earliest of them as they are accurately reported. The evening sitting opened at five, with the adjourned debate carried on from the preceding Wednesday, when it was commenced, on the Second Reading of the Bill for commuting Tithes in Ireland :

Mr. RONAYNE being in possession of the house then rose, and before he had concluded a sentence, no part of which was heard in the gallery,

Mr. O'CONNELL moved that the house be counted.

Suangers were accordingly ordered to withdraw.

On our return we found Mr. RONAYNE upon his legs. He was contending that the object of the hon. member for Dublin was obvious ; it was to show, that while Ministers could at five o'clock command upwards of 500 members to support a rotten pension list, yet that at 6 o'clock not much more than 100 could be assembled upon an Irish question, although that question was one of the utmost importance to the Irish nation. They had, in fact, on that night to consider whether the country should or should not be given up to the tender mercies of the police and military. This bill, he said, had grievously disappointed the people of Ireland. It was only a bill for the perpetuation of tithes under another name in Ireland. He objected to the plan, and in support of this objection he declared he would quote a letter attributed to the Marquis of Anglesey ; and here he took the opportunity of saying, that although the authenticity of the document had been at first disputed by the noble lord (Althorp) in consequence of the style, yet that now he believed it was acknowledged. With respect to the statements which had been made in that house, touching the fact of a gross breach of trust having been committed, whereby this paper came into his hands, he said he knew not whether it was intended to cast imputation upon himself. He understood from the noble lord that it was not ; but he had read in the newspapers certain paragraphs in which it was stated that a certain individual could not tell how it was possible that any gentlemen could make use of a document so obtained. He would only say to any individual, there or elsewhere, as far as any breach of confidence or treachery upon his part was concerned, that he gave the strongest and most indignant contradiction to the charge which the rules of the house would permit. He declined giving the authority upon which he put forth the document, and observed that he was justified in doing so by the precedent of the noble lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), who refused to give up the author of a calumnious attack upon the hon. and learned member for Tipperary. As to the opinions which the individual who had attacked him had put forth about honour, he no more regarded them than he would their opinions about political consistency. The hon. gentleman afterwards took occasion to remark that he saw the right hon. Secretary for the Colonies was smiling, and to take exception to the position in which the right hon. gentleman sat upon the Treasury benches, with his legs extended to the table. He said the right hon. Secretary displayed in his posture and bearing the *nonchalance* of an American coffeehouse, and that he

treated the house with marked contempt. (The hon. gentleman made some further remarks in the same strain, which we did not distinctly hear.)

The SPEAKER rose to order, and said that he himself had never felt, and that he was quite sure no hon. member of that house had ever felt, that the right hon. gentleman, or any other gentleman, had treated the house with contempt, or else they would have come forward and expressed that feeling openly and fully. (Cheers.)

Mr. RONAYNE said he had heard more than twenty members of that house say so, and he had heard them speak of the conduct of the right hon. gentleman in that house with disgust.

Mr. STANLEY rose to order. He thought it was rather strange that in the discussion of a public question, upon which he had not that night offered the slightest remark, on which he had made no sign, he should be thus virulently assailed. (Hear, hear.) It was true he might have smiled, but if he did, it was at the premeditated plan of the hon. gentleman, and the hon. and learned member for Dublin. (Hear, hear.) The hon. and learned gentleman, when there were 118 members present, moved a call of the house, a thing never done in Parliament before (cheers); and this for the purpose of enabling the hon. gentleman to use, in the exordium of his oration, the clap-trap that while on the discussion of the pension list question the Ministers could command upwards of 500 members at 5 o'clock, yet that the people of Ireland, on a question vitally concerning them, could only have the attendance of 113 members of the Imperial Parliament at 6 o'clock. (Loud cheers.) The people of Ireland were to be edified by this announcement! He hoped, however, if ever the hon. and learned gentleman should again think fit to count a house of 118 on an Irish question of such importance, to ascertain if there were 40 present, he would have the goodness to examine and declare how many of the 118 bore the name of Connell. (Great cheering.) At that moment it happened the only person in the house answering to the name of O'Connell was the hon. and learned member himself. (Continued cheering.)

Mr. O'CONNELL asked the house to remember, that although he had not said one word, the right hon. secretary had accused him, and accused him falsely, with his usual disregard of veracity. (Loud cries of "Oh, oh!") He withdrew the expression. ("Oh, oh!" and laughter.)

The SPEAKER stated that the hon. and learned gentleman must explain what he intended to convey. He could not enlarge upon the words which he had unfortunately expressed.

Mr. O'CONNELL said the right hon. gentleman had attacked him, he would say he accused him most unfoundedly. He accused him of having formed a plan with his hon. friend to bring that house into discredit with the people of Ireland. Never was there any thing more unfounded. A greater falsity—this was a Parliamentary word (laughter, and "Oh, oh!")—a greater falsity than this assertion never was uttered. (Laughter.) He had spent the last 48 hours in a state of the utmost anxiety. He was ready, and he had always been ready, to sacrifice himself for the pacification of Ireland. (Laughter.) When, however, he came down there that evening, it was with a shudder of abhorrence he remarked the small attendance of members (hear, hear), and especially of English members. (Hear, hear.) He then felt it to be his duty, and he never would be deterred from what he considered to be his duty by the sneers of the right hon. secretary,—he felt it is duty to have the house called, but he had entered into no arrangement with his hon. friend. The right hon. gentleman had made no excuse for his conduct. ("Hear," and laughter.) He asked, did the right hon. gentleman think it decent to act towards the house as he did—to use the mode of posture in which he placed himself in that house? ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) He thanked the hon. gentlemen for their cheers; but he would ask them if it were decent? ("Hear, hear," and continued laughter.) He thought it was exceedingly indecent. (Laughter.) He had heard 50 members say they were disgusted with it. What right had the right hon. Secretary of the Colonies to accuse him of combination? He had had the house called for the purpose of drawing a distinction

between the attendance of the members of that house in cases in which the Ministers were concerned, and those in which the people of Ireland were concerned. He might have been mistaken in this, but it was no reason why he should be attacked—why he should be accused of combination. The right hon. gentleman had nothing as a foundation for his charge but his own fancy. He (Mr. O'Connell) had been doing nothing. ("Hear," and laughter.) The right hon. gentleman had not answered his hon. friend. It was not the first time, however, he saw men ready to assail him who were very tranquil to others.

The debate then proceeded quietly in the following order: Mr. Ronayne and Mr. Lalor denounced the Tithe System and the present measure; Sir Henry Willoughby supported the Bill; the O'Connor Don, Mr. W. Roche, Mr. Ruthven, and Mr. Fitzgerald, all opposed it; because it neither diminished the burthen of tithes, nor altered the appropriation, but went to fix the same amount in a charge on the land, and still to apply that amount to the support of the Protestant Church.

Mr. O'Connell spoke next, and at some length. He said that for 74 years there had been a war against Tithes in Ireland, long, therefore, before he was born, and when the oldest agitator was in his cradle. The hatred to Tithe was founded on a religious abhorrence of the principle of compelling seven millions of poor Catholics to support, besides their own ministers, the priesthood of only one million of rich Protestants; and there could not be an end to that war, until the amount of Tithe was reduced, and its appropriation altered. He proposed, as an advance towards conciliation, that this Bill, which effected neither of these objects, should be withdrawn, and the following made the basis of a new Bill. That one-fifth of the Tithe should be given up by the clergy—one-fifth given up by the landlord—one-fifth bought up by a money payment from the Government—and the remaining two-fifths only be charged on the land as a tax, which might be redeemed at twenty years' purchase. This plan would require some sacrifice by the Clergy, some by the Landlord, and some by the Government—to the extent, indeed, of one-fifth of the whole amount from each, of about 200,000*l.* a year: and as we had given 800,000*l.* a year to satisfy the Planters and pacify the West India islands, he thought that one-fourth of that sum would be a cheap purchase for the pacification of Ireland. After a long, and unduly self-humbling speech, full of professions of the strongest desire for conciliation, Mr. O'Connell concluded thus:

Now, having taken the course which he suggested, supposing the Government were disposed to adopt it, the next thing would be to allocate the rest of the tithe. He would not say how it should be applied, for he assumed the principle that the tithe was not to be, as a whole, perpetual. As each incumbent dropped out in parishes where there was no Protestant inhabitants, the tithe of that might go to a general fund, which might be applied in charities, in supporting hospitals or dispensaries. But he would venture to ask whether it might not tend to the pacification of Ireland, if a part of the fund were to be applied to purchase small glebes for the Catholic clergy of the people of Ireland. When he said that, let him not be misunderstood. He did not speak it from authority, or from any communication with the parties concerned. So far from its giving satisfaction in those quarters, it might happen that he should be blamed for even the bare suggestion; but he was ready to bear that and more. He was ready to sacrifice his own feelings, if he could bring about that which he so earnestly desired—the pacification of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) He had now shown to the house that

for seventy-four years this war of tithes had existed in Ireland—that it had been *bellum plusquam civile*, during a great part of that time; and was the contest now at a close? The passing of this bill in its present state would, he feared, too surely show that its worst features were only in their commencement. How often had it been his lot, in those county-towns in Ireland, in which the judges of the land exercised their judicial functions, to be a witness to the loud lament, the shriek of agony, and the cry of despair, from the wives and children of those unfortunate men who were led off to undergo the punishment awarded, and he must say justly awarded, to their offences in resistance to tithes. He must have been more or less than human, if, while he admitted the justice of the punishment, he did not lament the injustice of continuing the system which had produced the crime, and he would ask was this system to be still continued? Was England to exhibit her weakness to Europe, by showing that she was unable to govern Ireland, by proving that she was not disposed to do her justice? He was willing to forget all that was passed, to make any and every sacrifice of his own feelings, if he could by that means procure the pacification of his country. (Hear, hear.) He could assure hon. members opposite, that he did not oppose this bill in any spirit of hostility. (Cheers.) If he had said any thing in haste or in anger at the commencement of his speech, he regretted and apologized for it. (Cheers.) He would recall every expression he had ever used—he would, he repeated, make every sacrifice of his own personal feelings, if he could succeed in persuading the Government to reconsider and remodel this measure. Let him and all connected with him be forgotten, and let the Government take all the credit, and enjoy all the praise, of being the pacificators of Ireland. (The hon. and learned gentleman sat down amidst loud cheers from both sides of the house.)

Mr. Shaw, on the part of the Protestants of Ireland, opposed the appropriation of any part of the wealth of the Church, or redeemed tithes, to the support of the Catholic priesthood. They had heard of highwaymen stopping individuals on the road, and when they had plundered them of their all, giving them in charity a few shillings to pay for a night's lodging, and this would be the treatment of the Protestant church in Ireland.

Mr. Stanley seized with avidity the opportunity of expressing the high sense he entertained of the altered tone and temper of the honourable and learned Member for Dublin, Mr. O'Connell. For that tone and that temper, in the name of the Government, and as a private individual, he returned the honourable and learned Member his grateful thanks! He called his speech the most eloquent of all the many eloquent speeches he had heard him deliver in that House; he complimented him upon his great and admitted talents—he spoke of the attention which was always due to his eminent abilities, and he confessed that he believed the object which Mr. O'Connell had at heart was the interest and happiness of his country. He went on in this strain of serious and earnest compliment and eulogy, till the hearers seemed almost to expect some proposition for making Mr. O'Connell Secretary for Ireland, or adding him to the Ministry, in some office or other: but, in truth, it was easily seen through, that the great charm of Mr. O'Connell's speech, in the eyes of his opponents, was not its eloquence, not its force—for we have heard him deliver many far superior, which drew down no praise from the Treasury benches; but it was its humility—its professions of a readiness to sacrifice all public views, and retire into private life, if peace could but be given in his own way to Ireland. After showing, however, that Mr. O'Connell's plan could not be acceded to, Mr. Stanley concluded thus:

He assured the house, and he assured the hon. and learned member for Dublin at the same time, that he had been compelled by principle to object to his views, because he felt they would not lead, either directly or ultimately, to the tranquillity of Ireland. He had given this answer to the statement of the hon. and learned member for Dublin, under the influence of no ill feeling towards him individually; on the contrary, he had no other feeling than that of sincere gratification at the manner in which the hon. and learned gentleman had stated his opinions, and of earnest desire that, for the sake of himself and his country, he would continue to preserve the same tone and temper which he had that night exhibited—a tone and temper which would be reciprocated by all who heard him in that house, and which would add still greater distinction to his parliamentary career than any which he had yet acquired, of which no man was more ready to admit the brilliance than the individual who was then addressing them. (Cheers.)

Mr. Fergusson made a short speech in favour of the present Bill, reserving his opinions as to the appropriation of the Tithe till a future occasion. But the speech of Lord John Russell, which was looked upon as a declaration of division in the Cabinet, and which was heard with alarm by the Tories, and with pleasure by the Liberals, each for the same reason, deserves to be given entire :

LORD JOHN RUSSELL said, that the able and eloquent speech of the hon. and learned member for Dublin had made so deep an impression upon his mind, that he could not, upon this occasion, bring himself to give a silent vote. (Hear, hear.) If the hon. and learned gentleman would always address the house with the same temper and moderation, he would find the house not only ready, but anxious to pay the same attention to the grievances of Ireland that it now paid to the grievances of England, or of Scotland. (Hear, hear.) He trusted that from what had occurred that night the hon. and learned gentleman would not draw from circumstances insignificant in themselves rash inferences, to the effect that the reformed House of Commons showed a disregard to the interests of Ireland. He asserted that no such disregard existed, as had been evinced by the eager attention which on various occasions, and particularly on that night, had been paid to the observations of the hon. and learned gentleman. (Cheers.) It appeared to him that there were now two distinct questions before the house, the first a question of amount, and the second a question of appropriation. As to the first, he thought that Ireland had no reason to complain of the amount of tithes which she had to pay. With regard to the appropriation of tithes, the hon. member for Tipperary had alluded the other night to his (Lord John Russell's) opinion given when he was out of office. But the only opinion on this subject he had given was in voting the motion of the hon. member for Middlesex, when he was averse to giving to the church of Ireland certain lands in perpetuity. He did not understand that this bill contained such a proposition. The question of appropriation ought to be wholly distinct from that of the amount; the question of appropriation should be kept entirely open. If the object of the bill was to grant a certain sum to the established church of Ireland and to end there, his opinion of the bill might be different. (Hear, hear.) He understood that it was to grant an amount of revenue, to be appropriated by the state to religious and charitable purposes, and if Parliament found it was not appropriated by the church to those religious and moral purposes for which such revenues are intended by all churches, then it would be the duty of Parliament to consider of a new appropriation. (Hear.) His opinion had been formed and given, not when out of office but when in office; and that opinion was, that the revenues of the church of Ireland were too great for the religious and moral instruction of the persons belonging to that church and to the stability of the church itself. (Cheers.) The more he had seen and reflected since, the more had that opinion been confirmed. He did not think it wise to mix the question of appropriation with the question of amount; but when Parliament had vindicated the property of the tithe, he should then be prepared to assert his opinion with regard to their appropriation; and if, when the revenue was once secured, the assertion of that opinion should lead him to



differ and separate from those with whom he was united by political connexion and for whom he entertained the deepest, private affection, he should feel much regret: yet, considering himself pledged, not only by his general duty as a member of that house, but by the resolution which had been passed the other day, to attend to the just complaints of the people of Ireland (cheers from the Irish members especially); and considering that, if there was a just ground of complaint on the part of any people against a grievance, it was the complaint of the people of Ireland against the present appropriation of tithes (loud cheers, which continued for some time); he should then, deeply lamenting the decision he was bound to come to, but at the same time considering that, having to the utmost of his power resisted all projects for the repeal of the union, and having by the support he gave to the bill for the maintenance of tithes, vindicated the right of their property against those who wrongfully withheld them; he should, at whatever cost and sacrifice, do what he should consider his bounden duty to do in justice to Ireland. (Loud cheering.)

The impression generally created by this speech was, that it was rather a prelude to some overtures having either been, or being about to be made to Mr. O'Connell, than a step in advance of any secession on the part of any of the present Cabinet from the Ministry; and this impression was strengthened by the great pains taken by Sir Francis Burdett—who has very rarely spoken of late—to act as a mediator.

Sir F. BURDETT said that, in the tone of the debate, and in the disposition manifested on each side of the house, both on the Ministerial bench and amongst Irish members, he thought he saw, for the first time, a glimpse of hope of removing what had been so long rankling in the minds of the Irish people, and of making that union, so important in other respects, a source of unity and happiness to both countries. (Hear.) This object appeared in a shape of such magnitude that all other subjects and details shrunk into utter insignificance. He was prepared to make as great a sacrifice, in a spirit of justice or of generosity, as any Irish member, for he felt it was both politic and wise in this country to carry this object into complete effect. He felt strongly upon this subject, for from an early period of life he had been deeply, though perhaps not prudently, implicated in it; but it was a subject which was calculated to drive a wise man mad. But he admitted that he felt then not as an Englishman, except as desiring to promote the good of his fellow subjects. He rejoiced at the feeling tone which had been employed, as this was a subject which had kept Ireland in a ferment at all times, as the great grievance of a large proportion of the population of Ireland, and if arranged at an early period, all heartburnings and discontent would have been prevented. The attempt at conciliation, which had been thrown out by the hon. and learned member for Dublin might, if the question of tithes was placed on a satisfactory ground to the Irish people, effect an adjustment of the question of the union; but if this opportunity were not taken, it might be lost for ever. (Hear.)

Major Beauleik, Mr. Barron, and Mr. D. Roche spoke after this, but amidst great noise and confusion. Even Mr. Littleton was not attentively heard. Mr. Shiel, however, commanded a slight attention while he asked the members of the Cabinet all round, whether each of them agreed with Lord John Russell, that the revenues of the Church were a fit subject for Parliamentary appropriation. This drew up Lord Althorp, who seemed to concur generally with Lord John Russell; but they both thought they should first secure the Tithes by fixing them as a charge on the land, payable by the owner, and then take their appropriation into consideration afterwards. Mr. Ward asked Mr. O'Connell to withdraw his opposition to the Bill, which Mr. O'Connell said he could not do, because it kept up the full amount of the Tithes; it made them more permanent by fixing them on the land, as a tax, instead of depending on its produce; and it still left their appropriation to the support of a Protestant Church, though paid by Catholic land-

owners, so that it made the whole matter worse instead of better than before. Mr. A. Lefroy supported the Bill for this very reason. Colonel Conolly with great vehemence expressed his astonishment at the speeches of Lord John Russell and Lord Althorp, and said he had been deceived by his credulity, for he thought he had been all along dealing with Ministers who were gentlemen, and men of honour. The Speaker's look rebuked the gallant Colonel—his friends also assuaged and softened his anger—and Mr. Littleton set him right by showing that he had fallen into a mistake, or had forgotten what took place when the question was first debated. Mr. To Wallace opposed the Bill, Lord Ebrington and Dr. Lefroy supported it; and after Mr. O'Connell had again stated his reasons for persisting in dividing the House on the question—it was put to the vote, when there appeared—For the second reading of the Bill, 248 : Against it, 52.

The analysis of this division, if the list of the majority could be obtained, which we fear would be impossible, would show a singular shrinking on the part of many English and Scotch Members, who remained in the House with the supporters of the Bill, though they have been among the loudest in denouncing the principle of Tithes being paid by a Catholic people to the support of a Protestant Church, on which principle the entire Bill is founded; as the Tithes are recognized on the face of the Bill as the property of the Irish Church, and are only made more permanent, and more easy of collection, by being transformed into a land tax, which makes the evil the greater.

Mr. Hume, Mr. Harvey, and Mr. Wilks, were absent, and were not included among the supporters of the Bill; but Mr. Brotherton, Major Beauchamp, Mr. Potter, Mr. Philips, Mr. Gillon, Mr. R. Wallace, Mr. Jervis, Mr. Warburton, and several others, who have usually been considered the most hostile to the principle of compelling people of one sect to pay for the support of another, were among the majority who voted in favour of a Bill which received, in its present shape, the cordial support of Mr. Shaw, Mr. Estcourt, Mr. Lefroy, and the most zealous defenders of the Irish Church and the Catholic Tithes, by which that Church is chiefly supported. We cannot but believe that they acted under some misconception of the nature of the Bill and its provisions, for we do not for a moment suspect their fidelity to the good cause of the principle of voluntary support in all religious establishments; or possibly they were mystified and bewildered by the strange scenes of the evening, from the uproar of the opening of the debate, when mutual recriminations were the order of the night, to the middle part of the discussion, when reciprocal flatteries were so freely interchanged, and onward to the end, when fierce denunciations, checked only by the eagle eye of the Speaker, levelled partly in admonition, and partly in rebuke, alone prevented a crisis which might have ended in anything but pacification. These rapidly-shifting scenes might have confounded some, as we know they amused many; but whatever was the cause, we cannot but regret that the friends of religious liberty, who claim exemption from Church Rates for English Dissenters, did not come out more boldly and more numerous, to contend for equal emancipation from Church Tithes for their Catholic brother Dissenters in Ireland.

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE VOYAGE AND DISCOVERIES OF CAPTAIN ROSS.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the circumstances of the Expedition to the Arctic Seas, commanded by Captain JOHN ROSS, of the Royal Navy, with a view to ascertain whether any and what Reward may be due for the Services rendered on that occasion, and to report their Observations thereupon to the House; together with the Minutes of Evidence taken before them:—Have inquired into the matters referred to them, and agreed to the following Report:

Your Committee have not felt themselves either called upon by their order of reference or competent to give an opinion on the precise merits or extent of the discoveries made during the Expedition commanded by Captain JOHN ROSS, whether in a geographical or scientific point of view; they have therefore confined themselves to such a general investigation into the facts, as may suffice for a decision on the main question committed to their hands, whether any Reward should be allotted from the public purse, and to whom that Reward is due.

In the course of this Inquiry they find that, in the year 1827, Captain ROSS, stimulated by the desire of securing to this country the honour of settling the long-agitated question of a North-west Passage, proposed first to His Majesty's Government, and, on their declining to undertake it, to his friend, Mr. Felix BOOTH, to fit out an Expedition for that purpose: that in the following year Mr. BOOTH, finding that the Act, by which a Parliamentary Reward was held out for the discovery of a North-west Passage, had been repealed, and that no suspicion of interested motives could any longer rest upon the undertaking, "having no other object in view than the advancement of the honour of his country and the interests of science, and to gratify the feelings of a friend," immediately agreed to Captain ROSS's proposition, on condition that his connexion with the enterprise should not be made known: that accordingly, with the exception of about two thousand pounds expended by Captain ROSS, Mr. BOOTH did actually bear all the charges of the Expedition, to the amount of between seventeen and eighteen thousand pounds: that Captain ROSS, being left by Mr. BOOTH at liberty to choose whom he pleased to accompany him, received gratuitous offers of zealous service and assistance, in any capacity, from those distinguished officers, Captains BACK and HOPPER, offers equally creditable to Captain ROSS and to the spirit of those who made them; but finally selected his nephew, Commander JAMES CLARK ROSS, a young officer of distinguished scientific attainments, who had been employed in every previous Expedition to the Arctic Seas; and having engaged Mr. THOMAS PURSER, who, as well as Commander ROSS, agreed to go without pay, and Mr. M'DIARMID as surgeon, together with a crew of nineteen men, sailed from England in May, 1829: that in spite of the mutiny of the crew of a Whaler, which had been engaged to accompany them with provisions, Captain ROSS persevered, in reliance on finding the supplies which had been landed by the *Fury*, on *Fury Beach*, and then entered upon a course of sufferings, of dangers and discoveries; for a summary of which your Committee would refer the House to the following letter addressed by him to the Secretary of the Board of Admiralty.

On board the *Isabella* of Hull, Baffin's Bay,  
September, 1833.

Sir,

KNOWING how deeply my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty are interested in the advancement of natural knowledge, and particularly in the improvement of geography, I have to acquaint you, for the information of their Lordships, that the expedition, the main object of which was to solve if possible the question of

a North-west Passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, particularly by Prince Regent's Inlet, and which sailed from England in May 1829, notwithstanding the loss of the fore mast, and other untoward circumstances, which obliged the vessel to refit in Greenland, reached the beach on which His Majesty's late ship *Fury's* stores were landed, on 13th August.

We found the boats, provisions, &c. in excellent condition, but no vestige of the wreck. After completing in fuel and other necessities, we sailed on the 14th, and on the following morning rounded Cape Gang, where our new discoveries commenced, and keeping the Western Shore close on board, ran down the coast in a S.W. by W. course, in from ten to twenty fathoms, until we had passed the latitude of  $72^{\circ}$  north in longitude  $94^{\circ}$  west; here we found a considerable inlet leading to the westward, the examination of which occupied two days; at this place we were first seriously obstructed by ice, which was now sure to extend, from the South Cape of the inlet, in a solid mass, round by south and east to E. N. E. Owing to this circumstance, the shallowness of the water, the rapidity of the tides, the tempestuous weather, the irregularity of the coast, and the numerous inlets and rocks, for which it is remarkable, our progress was no less dangerous than tedious, yet we succeeded in penetrating below the latitude of  $70^{\circ}$  north in longitude  $92^{\circ}$  west, where the land, after having carried us as far east as  $90^{\circ}$ , took a decided westerly direction, while land at the distance of forty miles to southward, was seen trending east and west. At this extreme point our progress was arrested on 1st October by an impenetrable barrier of ice. We, however, found an excellent wintering port which we named Felix Harbour.

Early in January 1830, we had the good fortune to establish a friendly intercourse with a most interesting association of natives, who, being insulated by nature, had never before communicated with strangers; from them we gradually obtained the important information that we had already seen the Continent of America, that, about forty miles to the south-west there were two great seas, one to the west, which was divided from that to the east by a narrow strait or neck of land. The verification of this intelligence either way, on which our future operations so materially depended, devolved on Commander Ross, who volunteered this service early in April, accompanied by one of the mates, and guided by two of the natives, proceeded to the spot, and found that the north land was connected to the south, by two ridges of high land, 15 miles in breadth; but taking into account a chain of fresh water lakes, which occupied the valleys between, the dry land, which actually separates the two oceans, is only five miles. This extraordinary isthmus was subsequently visited by myself, when Commander Ross proceeded minutely to survey the sea-coast to the southward of the isthmus leading to the westward, which he succeeded in tracing to the 99th degree, or to 150 miles of Cape Turnagain, of Franklin, to which point the land, after leading him into the 70th degree of north latitude, trended directly; during the same journey he also surveyed 30 miles of the adjacent coast, or that to the north of the isthmus which, by also taking a westerly direction, formed the termination of the western sea into a gulph. The rest of this season was employed in tracing the sea coast south of the isthmus, leading to the eastward, which was done so as to leave no doubt that it joined, as the natives had previously informed us, to Ackullee, and the land forming Repulse Bay. It was also determined that there was no passage to the westward for 30 miles to the northward of our position.

This summer like that of 1818, was beautifully fine, but extremely unfavourable for navigation, and our object being now to try a more northern latitude, we waited with anxiety for the disruption of the ice; but in vain, and our utmost endeavours did not succeed in retracing our steps more than four miles, and it was not until the middle of November, that we succeeded in cutting the vessel into a place of security, which we named "Sheriff's Harbour." I may here mention, that we named the newly discovered continent, to the southward, "Boothia," as also the isthmus, the peninsula to the north, and the eastern sea, after my worthy friend Felix Booth, esquire, the truly patriotic citizen of London, who, in the most disinterested manner enabled me to equip this expedition in a superior style.

The last winter was in temperature, nearly equal to the means of what had been

experienced on the four preceding voyages, but the winters of 1830 and 1831, set in with a degree of violence hitherto beyond record, the thermometer sank to 92° degrees below the freezing point, and the average of the year was 10° below the preceding; but notwithstanding the severity of the summer, we travelled across the country to the West Sea, by a chain of lakes, 30 miles north of the isthmus, when Commander Ross succeeded in surveying 50 miles more of the coast leading to the N.W. and, by tracing the shore to the northward of our position, it was also fully proved that there could be no passage below the 71st degree.

This autumn we succeeded in getting the vessel only 14 miles to the northward, and as we had not doubled the Eastern Cape, all hope of saving the ship was at an end, and put quite beyond possibility by another very severe winter, and having only provisions to last us to 1st June, 1832, dispositions were accordingly made to move the ship in her present port, which (after her) was named "Victory Harbour." Provisions and fuel being carried forward in the spring, we left the ship on 29th May, 1832, for Fury Beach, being the only chance left of saving our lives: owing to the very rugged nature of the ice, we were obliged to keep either upon or close to the land, making the circuit of every bay, thus increasing our distance of 200 miles by nearly one-half, and it was not until the 1st of July, that we reached the beach, completely exhausted by hunger and fatigue.

A hut was speedily constructed, and the boats, three of which had been washed on the beach, but providentially driven on shore again, were repaired during this month; but the unusual heavy appearance of the ice afforded us no cheering prospect until 1st August, when in three boats we reached the ill-fated spot where the Fury was first driven on shore, and it was not until the 1st September we reached Leopold South Island, now established to be the N. E. point of America, in lat. 73° 56' and long. 90° west. From the summit of the lofty mountain on the promontory we could see Prince Regent's Inlet, Barrow's Strait, and Lancaster Sound, which presented one impenetrable mass of ice just as I had seen in 1818; here we remained in a state of anxiety and suspense, which may be easier imagined than described. All our attempts to push through were vain; at length being forced by want of provisions and the approach of a most severe winter to return to Fury Beach, where alone there remained wherewith to sustain life; there we arrived on 7th of October, after a most fatiguing and laborious march, having been obliged to leave our boats at Batty Bay. Our habitation, which consisted in a frame of spars, 32 feet by 16, covered with canvas, was during the month of November inclosed, and the roof covered with snow from four to seven feet thick, which being saturated with water when the temperature was 15° below zero, immediately took the consistency of ice, and thus we actually became the inhabitants of an iceberg during one of the most severe winters hitherto recorded; our sufferings aggravated by want of bedding, clothing, and animal food need not be dwelt upon. Mr. C. Thomas the carpenter was the only man who perished at this beach, but three others, besides one who had lost his foot, were reduced to the last stage of debility, and only thirteen of our number were able to carry provisions in seven journeys of 62 miles each to Batty Bay. We left Fury Beach on 8th July, carrying with us three sick men which were unable to walk, and in six days we reached the boats, where the sick daily recovered. Although the spring was mild it was not until the 15th August that we had any cheering prospect, a gale from the westward having suddenly opened a lane of water along shore; in two days we reached our former position, and from the mountain we had the satisfaction of seeing clear water almost directly across Prince Regent's Inlet, which we crossed on 17th, and took shelter from a storm 12 miles to the eastward of Cape York. Next day, when the gale abated, we crossed Admiralty Inlet, and were detained six days on the coast by a strong north-east wind. On the 25th we crossed Navy Board Inlet, and on the following morning, to our inexpressible joy, we descried a ship in the offing becalmed, which proved to be the *Isabella* of Hull, the same ship which I commanded in 1818; at noon we reached her, when her enterprising commander, who had in vain searched for us in Prince

Regent's Inlet, after giving us three cheers, received us with every demonstration of kindness and hospitality which humanity could dictate.\* I ought to mention, also, that Mr. Humphries, by landing me at Possession Bay, and subsequently on the west coast of Baffin's Bay, afforded me an excellent opportunity of concluding my survey, and of verifying my former chart of that coast.

I now have the pleasing duty of calling the attention of their Lordships to the merits of Commander Ross, who was second in the direction of this Expedition. The labours of this officer, who had the departments of Astronomy, Natural History, and Surveying, will speak for themselves in language beyond the ability of my pen, but they will be duly appreciated by their Lordships and the learned bodies, of which he is a member, and who are already well acquainted with his acquirements.

My steady and faithful friend, Mr. William Thom, of the Royal Navy, who was formerly with me in the *Isabella*, besides his duty as third in command, took charge of the Meteorological Journal, the distribution and economy of provisions; and to his judicious plans and suggestions must be attributed the uncommon degree of health which our crew enjoyed; and as two out of the three who died the four and a half years, were cut off early in the voyage by diseases not peculiar to the climate, only one man can be said to have perished.

Mr. McDiarmid, the surgeon, who had been several voyages to these regions, did justice to the high recommendation I received of him; he was successful in every amputation and operation which he performed, and wonderfully so in his treatment of the sick; and I have no hesitation in adding, that he would be an ornament to His Majesty's service.

Commander Ross, Mr. Thom, and myself, have, indeed, been serving without pay, but, in common with the crew, have lost our all, which I regret the more because it puts it totally out of my power adequately to remunerate my fellow-sufficers, whose case I cannot but recommend for their Lordship's consideration.

We have, however, the consolation that the results of this Expedition have been conclusive, and to science highly important; and may be briefly comprehended in the following words: The discovery of the Gulph of Boothia, the Continent and Isthmus of Boothia Felix, and a vast number of islands, rivers, and lakes; the undeniable establishment, that the N. E. point of America extends to the 74th degree of north latitude. Valuable observations of every kind, but particularly on the magnet, and to crown all, we have had the honour of placing the illustrious name of our most gracious sovereign, William the Fourth, on the true position of the Magnetic Pole.

I cannot conclude this Letter, Sir, without acknowledging the important advantages we obtained, from the valuable publications of Sir Edward Parry and Sir John Franklin, and the communication kindly made to us by these distinguished officers before our departure from England.

But the glory of this enterprize is entirely due to Him whose divine favour has been most especially manifested towards us, who guided and directed all our steps, who mercifully provided effectual means for our preservation, and who, even after the devices and inventions of man had utterly failed, crowned our humble endeavours with complete success.

I have the honour to be, &c.

JOHN ROSS, Captain, R. N.

Your Committee have found the statements contained in the above Letter confirmed, as far as they have been examined by the evidence which has appeared before them; and supported by the opinions of Captain Beaufort, hydrographer to the Admiralty, of Mr. Children, one of the secretaries of the Royal Society, and of Professor Barlow, who has made the magnetic variations his particular study, they see no reason to doubt that Captain Ross nearly approached, and that Commander Ross actually reached the Magnetic Pole.

The importance, especially to a maritime nation, of this discovery and of the observations connected with magnetic science, arising thereout, is most highly estimated by the scientific witnesses who have been examined, and is further

attested by the zeal with which this branch of science has been of late pursued by eminent men in every country, and by the expense which several foreign governments have of late years incurred for the same object.

Under these circumstances your Committee can have no hesitation in reporting, that a great public service has been performed. Independently of the demonstration that one passage, which had been considered by preceding navigators to be one of the most likely to lead from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, does not exist, thus narrowing the field for future expeditions, if such should ever be undertaken; independently of the addition of between six and seven hundred miles of coast to our geographical knowledge, and of the valuable additions to magnetic science and meteorology, which this Expedition will supply, your Committee cannot overlook the public service which is rendered to a maritime country, especially in time of peace, by deeds of daring enterprise and patient endurance of hardship, which excite the public sympathy and enlist the general feeling in favour of maritime adventure. Of this result they have strong evidence in the national subscription which furnished the funds for the expedition of Captain Back, in search of Captain Ross and his gallant party, to which the Government also contributed Two Thousand Pounds.

To the importance of these considerations, your Committee are happy to have to report that His Majesty's Government has not been insensible. Although Captain Ross's expedition was undertaken entirely on private risk, and the Board of Admiralty could not therefore be held responsible for any liabilities incurred, or be called upon in strictness to notice in any way the services of the individuals engaged in it, yet, as far as the power of the Admiralty extends, none of these services has gone unnoticed or unrewarded. It appears from a Memorandum delivered in to your Committee by the Admiralty, that "all the men have received double full pay until they finally abandoned their ship, and full pay after that until their arrival in England, amounting to the gross sum of 4580*l.*; that they have besides been employed in eligible situations in the Dock Yards, or placed in others that will lead to promotion;" that Mr. Abernethy, the gunner, "has been promoted, and appointed to the Seringapatam;" that Mr. Thom, purser, "has been appointed to the lucrative situation of purser of the *Canopus*, of 84 guns;" that Mr. M'Diarmid, the medical officer of the Expedition, "has been appointed assistant-surgeon of the Navy, and, when qualified to pass his examination, will be promoted to the rank of surgeon;" that Commander Ross, to whom it appears that the greater part of the scientific results of the Expedition are due, "has been placed on full pay, and appointed Commander of the *Victory* for twelve months, that he may by that length of service be enabled to receive the rank of Post Captain, which is by a special minute of the Admiralty ensured to him at the expiration of that time;" and that Captain John Humphreys, of the *Isabella*, to whose persevering humanity alone Captain Ross and his party, under Providence, in all probability owe their lives, has received that remuneration for the expense of bringing them home which, upon consideration, has been thought proper by the Admiralty, and which appears to your Committee to be a reasonable compensation. Captain Ross alone, the Commander of the Expedition, who had the anxious and painful responsibility of the health and discipline of the party for above four years, under circumstances of unparalleled difficulty and hardship, and who had the merit of maintaining both health and discipline in a remarkable degree (for only one man in twenty-three was lost in consequence of the Expedition), is, owing to his rank, not in a situation to receive any reward from the Admiralty in the way of promotion. Having incurred expenses and losses to the amount of nearly three thousand pounds, and received no more than the half pay which had accumulated during the Expedition, he remains with the same rank with which he went out. Under these circumstances, and looking to the advantages to science and the honour to his country, which have resulted from the expedition under his command; looking to the expense which the Country has been willing to incur on former occasions for similar expeditions, and to the rewards which it has voted even for less important and honourable objects, your Committee hope they are not transgress-

ing the bounds of a due regard to public economy, in recommending that a sum of Five Thousand Pounds be voted to Captain John Ross.

To Mr. Felix Booth, to whose modest public spirit and rare munificence this Expedition is entirely due, your Committee regret that they have it not in their power to propose some fit token of public acknowledgment; but they cannot forbear offering the tribute of their admiration and respect.

The case of a poor man afflicted with blindness in consequence of the Expedition has been brought before the notice of your Committee by a Member of the House; and your Committee beg to recommend it to such consideration, as to his Majesty's Government, after due investigation of the facts, may seem fit.

April, 1834.

---

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR.

---

### IMPORTANCE OF ORGANIZATION, ACTIVITY, AND UNITY IN TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES.

SIR,

Sunderland, April, 1834.

As you were pleased to approve so highly of my former communication, perhaps you will allow me further to suggest that, as Temperance Societies are rapidly increasing in number and importance, it is much to be desired that they should be reduced to some systematic organization, so that, when necessary, they might all act together for any given purpose, and be moved with as much regularity as a piece of well-constructed machinery. The Parent Society in London, as the head, could direct and govern the Branch Societies, as the members; and they would thus form one large and influential body politic. All our Missionary, Bible, and other Associations, religious and political, act upon this plan; and we have on many occasions seen how much may be effected by UNITED EFFORT. As Temperance Societies are daily acquiring increased strength, it is the more desirable that their efforts should be *simultaneous and well-directed*.

Another important advantage, attending such an arrangement, would be the extraordinary facility with which the necessary supplies of money could be collected. Let every town where a Temperance Society has been formed be divided into districts; let each member of the Committee, or of a Sub-Committee to be formed for the purpose, have the charge of a district; and let him, amongst other duties, receive *one penny per month* of each member within his limits.

It appears by the TEMPERANCE HERALD for the current month, that the aggregate number of members of all the Temperance Societies in England and Wales, is 76,577. If each of these individuals would contribute the very small sum of only *one penny per month*, an annual income of more than *three thousand, eight hundred pounds* would be realized at once; and as there is every prospect of our numbers rapidly increasing, we may safely calculate upon a proportionably augmented income.

Monthly or quarterly public meetings (*of which sufficient notice should be given*) should also be *regularly* held; periodical reports might be forwarded from the various societies in every shire to the provincial society at the county town; and each Provincial Society could be in regular correspondence with the great Head in London. Thus a constant communication would be kept up amongst all the societies in the kingdom, and incalculable is the benefit that could not fail to result from it.

Until some such arrangement be adopted, the desultory and not unfrequently ill-directed efforts of separate societies will accomplish but little permanent good. Our motto must be—"*A long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether*;" and then we may fairly hope to accomplish our object.

A FRIEND OF TEMPERANCE.



# ON THE DIFFICULTIES AND FRAUDS WHICH WOULD ATTEND THE PROPOSED SCALE OF TEA DUTIES.

SIR,

Black Rock, April, 1834.

May I take the liberty of calling the attention of your readers, members of the Legislature, to a letter which has appeared in the *London Mercantile Journal*, signed JOHN TRAVERS, on the subject of the Tea Duties; the PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW being more likely to bring the matter immediately under their notice than a mere commercial paper. This letter is distinguished by good sense: it is as full, clear, and succinct an exposition as I have ever met with in the same space, and ought to be *conclusive* on the subject. On one point I differ from Mr. Travers; I believe the *object* of Government in adopting the graduated scale was truly to *benefit the poorer classes*, but I am equally persuaded the *view* was a most mistaken one, and must be abandoned. It would lead to interminable fraud, perjury, and confusion. It may be attempted, but, after all the vexation of an unsuccessful trial, I will venture to predict, it will be found *impracticable*.

An article in the *Mercantile Journal* of 1st of April, asserts, "that two different inspectors might charge a *different* duty on the *same* cargo of Tea, to the extent of 50,000*l.*!!!" and Mr. Travers confirms this assertion. Can it be possible Government would leave such an irresistible temptation open to corruption, nay, almost to integrity? Mr. Travers admits *this* to be an extreme case, but asserts, "without fear of contradiction," that frauds to the extent of 5000*l.* or 10,000*l.* may *easily be practiced*, and are, indeed, *likely to be of ordinary occurrence*. This does not mend the matter, it merely breaks down the 50,000*l.* into smaller sums.

Again, Mr. Travers shows, that, independent of every consideration of fraud, the Tea Brokers, who are supposed to be the most experienced judges, *vary* in their individual opinions *always* to the extent of 1*d.* to 2*d.* per pound; and often from 3*d.* to 6*d.* per pound upon every break or parcel of Tea put up at every sale; and it is to be observed, that less than the former will determine the different duties. As, therefore, such difference of opinion *has* existed, Mr. Travers justly concludes "it *will exist* still," and that "*any thing like uniformity of opinion is unattainable*."

Again, Mr. Travers shows, that really *there is no boundary line between any of the several descriptions of Tea*; that the characters of Teas are *so intermingled* as not to be *distinguishable*, and that the prices of them actually *run into each other*.

Under such circumstances, what plan ought Government to pursue? I believe every person who reads these statements will unhesitatingly answer, the simple one of a UNIFORM DUTY, which will save much trouble to the revenue, and much vexation to the trade.

I know not whether Mr. Travers is in Parliament or not, but I do know a commercial city cannot be at a loss for a suitable representative while it possesses such men, one of whom outweighs in value a hundred speechmakers. I trust Mr. Travers's letter may be sought for and read by every member in the House before the question comes on for discussion, and I doubt not it will receive the consideration it deserves.

I am, &amp;c. &amp;c.

R. T. H.

[We are ready to admit all the facts stated in the letter adverted to by our intelligent Correspondent; for we pointed out these very consequences in the speech delivered by us in Parliament during the present session, as well as in the last. Our correction of these evils, however, would be, not by a uniform rate of duty on Teas of all prices, but by an *ad valorem* duty on the actual prices produced at a public monthly sale in every port to which Tea should be imported, and by which alone (as shown in the speech of the present session), the two great objects of safety against frauds on the revenue, and fairness towards the consumer, can be united.]—EDITOR.

SINGULAR MODE OF AFFIXING TERMS TO THE FIGHTING A  
DUEL.

SIR,

*Caversham, April, 1834.*

Observing that you have given notice of a motion for leave to bring in a Bill for the prevention of Duelling, I venture to call your attention to the following sensible letter, written in December, 1785, by Mr. Witham, to a Mr. Stewart, by whom he was challenged. Pray give it a place in your PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW, which I read with great satisfaction.

E. O.

SIR,—You say I have insulted you, and the matter may, or may not be so; but I possess too much good sense to risk my life against yours for so foolish a circumstance, as I am at present situated. It is, however, in your power, if you choose to fight, to enable me to meet you.

You are an unmarried man, with a good fortune, and if you were shot through the head to-morrow, there could only be a fashionable tear for your exit, and the heirs at law would rejoice at the circumstance. I am a married man, and have a wife and nine children, an aged mother, and two sisters, who all depend on me for their existence. They have no other father, husband, or protector, and I am but a tenant for life to an estate, which at my decease, if I die before my aged mother, goes to a family, with whom I have long been at law, and who, in that case, would not give sixpence to mine.

I regard the punctilios of a gentleman as much as any other person, provided those punctilios are within the bounds of common sense; and, therefore, in order to prove to you that I am not afraid to meet you in the bullet-field of honour, I hereby promise to fight you either with pistols or with swords, whenever you shall have secured, *in case of my being killed*, 200*l.* per annum to my wife, and 50*l.* per annum to each of my children, during their lives. This will enable them to live when I am gone.

If you do not comply with this request, I shall suppose that your challenge was a mere piece of bravado—knowing what a family I have, and that you are afraid to meet me—now that I have put it into your power to show whether you have courage or not. You cannot plead want of money on this occasion, because I know you have 40,000*l.* in stock, exclusive of a clear estate of 600*l.* per annum.

I am, Sir, &amp;c.

The terms were not accepted.—But I think the letter deserves to be preserved as a model, and to show that sensible men may refuse such meetings without disgrace.

EFFECT OF HABITUAL DRUNKENNESS ON FAMILIES IN THE  
HIGHER AND MIDDLE CLASSES.

AN individual, who has watched the public conduct of Mr. Buckingham, is rejoiced to see that he has given notice of his intention to bring before Parliament and the world, the degrading vice of Drunkenness, so prevalent in this metropolis and the country. It is anxiously hoped that Mr. Buckingham's efforts will lead to some useful practical measure, and not end in a few speeches—a few laughs, and hear! hear!—and an insignificant minority. There are but few families in which some weak-minded individual is not to be found addicted to this vice—some poor creature who has acquired the habit of drinking to excess—who becomes in that state a fool—a madman—a tyrant at home, and a constant annoyance to his relatives. It is not necessary for him who takes the liberty of addressing Mr. Buckingham to point out the evils of drunkenness in the thousand shapes in which they appear—he feels the evils, and hails with gratitude every attempt to check their progress. An habitual drunkard ought not to stand as he

does at present, on a level with sober, steady men. He ought, by the laws of his country, to be degraded—punished. His friends, after a certain length of time, ought to have (as in the case of lunatics) power to place him under restraint, with a view to his reformation. [To such an erring individual confinement would be an act of mercy. Propose, my dear Sir, some bold measures—never mind whose interest suffers,—distillers—gin-shop keepers;—propose severer regulations on publicans, and all interested in encouraging the useless consumption, of intoxicating liquors—increase the 5s. fine for being found drunk. Think of some plan that shall make (if possible) the sottish portion of the community, and the rising generation, ashamed of the vice. What if gin-shops were only allowed to be open during certain hours in the day?—Propose to *punish* the drunkard, whatever his grade in life may be; render a convicted habitual drunkard incapable of opening a shop, or carrying on business, except upon satisfactory proof of his reformation. You will be ridiculed—insulted. Never mind,—go on—and prove yourself a benefactor to your country and the world.

## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

### MAJORITY OF 127.

Tellers included, who, on the 30th of April, voted for the Second Reading of Sir Andrew Agnew's Bill, for the Better Observance of the Lord's Day.

Baines, E.	Fenton, J.	Langston, J. H.	Rotch, B.
Bateson, Sir R.	Fergusson, R. C.	Lefevre, C. S.	Ryle, J.
Bell, M.	Finch, G.	Lefroy, A.	Sanderson, R.
Bethell, R.	Fleetwood, P. H.	Lefroy, T.	Sandon, Viscount
Blackstone, W. S.	Foley, J. H. H.	Lennox, Lord A.	Sanford, E. A.
Bolling, W.	Folkes, Sir W. B.	Lister, E. C.	Scott, Sir E. D.
Boss, Captain	Forster, C. S.	Lopes, Sir R.	Seale, Colonel
Briscoe, J. I.	Freemantle, Sir T.	Mankleville, Viscont.	Shaw, F.
Brocklehurst, J.	Gaskell, J. M.	Marsland, T.	Sheppard, T.
Bruce, C.	Gladstone, W. E.	Marryatt, J.	Simeon, Sir R. G.
Buxton, T. F.	Glynn, Sir S. R.	Martin, J.	Sinclair, G.
Calcraft, J. H.	Goring, H. D.	Maxwell, J. W.	Stanton, Sir G.
Callander, J. H.	Goulburn, Rt. Hon. H.	Maxwell, H.	Stewart, Sir M. S.
Cavendish, Lord	Grant, Rt. Hon. R.	Miles, W.	Stewart, E.
Chapman, A.	Greene, T.	Moreton, Hon. H.	Thompson, Alderman
Chaytor, Sir W.	Grey, Sir G.	Morpeth, Viscount	Tollemache, Hon. N.
Childers, J. W.	Halcomb, J.	Mosley, Sir O.	Tooke, W.
Conolly, Colonel	Halford, H.	Palmer, R.	Troubridge, Sir T.
Cotes, J.	Handley, W. F.	Patten, J. W.	Verner, Colonel
Curteis, Captain	Hanmer, Sir J.	Parker, J.	Verney, Sir H.
Dalrymple, Sir J. H.	Hardy, J.	Parrott, J.	Vernon, Hon. G.
Dare, R. W. H.	Harland, W. C.	Percival, Colonel	Vivian, J. H.
Dugdale, W. S.	Hawes, B.	Petre, Hon. E. R.	Waterpark, Lord
Duncombe, Hon. W.	Hay, Sir J.	Phillips, C. M.	Welby, G. E.
Dundas, Captain	Hill, Sir R.	Phillipotts, J.	Whitmore, T. C.
Dunlop, Captain	Hodgson, J.	Plumptre, J. P.	Wilks, J.
Eastnor, Viscount	Hope, Sir A.	Pryme, G.	Wilmot, Sir E.
Egerton, W. T.	Hughes, H.	Rae, Hon. Sir W.	Wilbraham, G.
Estcourt, T. G.	Ingham, R.	Rice, Hon. T. S.	Williams, R.
Etwall, R.	Jermyn, Earl	Rickford, W.	Young, G. F.
Evans, W.	Jones, Captain	Rider, T.	Young, J.
Ewing, J.	King, E. B.		

Tellers.—Agnew, Sir A.—Johnston, A.

### PAIRED OFF.

Chandos, Marquis	Handley, H.	Maxwell, J.	Tynte, Colonel
Clare, R. W. H.	Hope, H. T.	Pease, J.	Tynte, C. J. K.
Grosvenor, Lord R.			

## MINORITY of 150,

Tellers included, who, on the 5th of May, voted for the motion of Mr. Harvey, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, that He will be graciously pleased to direct inquiry to be made into the consideration of each Pension, as it appears in the List ordered to be printed by His faithful Commons, on the 28th of August, 1833, with a view to be assured, that such persons only are in the receipt of the public money, as have just claims on the Royal beneficence; or who by their personal services to the Crown, by their performance of duties to the public, or by their useful discoveries in science, and attainments in literature and the arts, have merited the gracious consideration of their Sovereign, and the gratitude of their Country."

## ENGLAND.

Adams, E. H.	Curteis, E. B.	Hardy, J.	Rickford, W.
Aglionby, H. A.	Dashwood, G. H.	Heathcote, J.	Rippon, C.
Attwood, T.	Davies, Col.	Hill, M. D.	Roebuck, R. A.
Baillie, J. E.	Dykes, F. L. B.	Hoskins, K.	Robinson, G. R.
Banbridge, E. T.	Edwards, J.	Hughes, H.	Rotch, B.
Barnard, E. G.	Ellis, W.	Hudson, T.	Scholefield, J.
Beauclerk, Major	Etwell, M.	Humphery, J.	Scrope, C. P.
Berkeley, Hn. G. C. F.	Evans, Col.	Hutt, W.	Spry, S. T.
Berkeley, Hn. C. F.	Faithfull, G.	James, W.	Tancred, H. W.
Bewes, I.	Fellowes, Hn. A. W.	Jervis, J.	Tennyson, Hon. C.
Bish, T.	Fenton, J.	Ingilby, Sir W.	Tollmach, A. G.
Blake, Sir F.	Feilden, W.	Kennedy, J.	Tooke, W.
Blamire, W.	Fielden, J.	Laughton, Col.	Trelawney, Sir W.
Blandford, Marquis	Fleetwood, P. H.	Leech, J.	Turner, W.
Boss, J. G.	Fort, J.	Lennox, Lord W.	Tynte, C. J. C.
Bowes, J.	Fryer, R.	Lister, B. L.	Vincent, Sir F.
Briggs, R.	Gaskell, D.	Lister, E. C.	Walter, J.
Brotherton, J.	Godson, R.	Marryatt, J.	Watson, R.
Buckingham, J. S.	Goring, G. H. D.	Methuen, P.	Watkins, J. L.
Bulwer, E. L.	Grote, G.	Mills, J.	Warburton, H.
Chaytor, Sir W.	Guest, J.	Parrott, J.	Whalley, Sir S.
Clay, W.	Gully, J.	Pease, J.	Williams, Col.
Codrington, Sir E.	Hall, B.	Philips, M.	Williams, W.
Collier, J.	Halse, J.	Potter, R.	Wilks, J.
Crawley, S.	Handley, H.	Ramsbottom, J.	Wilmot, Sir E.
Curteis, H. B.	Handley, Major	Richards, J.	Wood, Alderman

## SCOTLAND.

Gillon, W. D.	Oswald, R. A.	Pagnell, Sir H.	Wallace, R.
Oliphant, L.	Oswald, J.	Sandford, Sir D. K.	

## IRELAND.

Baldwin, Dr.	Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connell, D.	Roynane, D.
Barr, G. S.	Fitzsimon, N.	O'Connell, C.	Ruthven, E. S.
Bollew, R. M.	French, F.	O'Connell, M.	Ruthven, E.
Blake, M. J.	Grattan, H.	O'Connell, M.	Sheil, R. L.
Blackney, W.	Lalor, P.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Sullivan, R.
Butler, Hon. Colonel	Lynch, A. H.	O'Farrell, R. M.	Talbot, J. H.
Chapman, M. L.	Macnamara, F.	O'Reilly, W.	Vigors, N. A.
Copeland, Alderman	Nagle, Sir R.	Roche, W.	Walker, C. A.
Finn, W. F.	O'Brien, C.	Roche, D.	Wallace, T.
Fitzgerald, T.			

TELLERS.—Harvey, D. W.—Hume, J.

## PAIRED OFF.

O'Connor, F.	O'Connell, J.	King, E. B.	Molesworth, Sir W.
--------------	---------------	-------------	--------------------

## MINORITY OF 54,

Tellers included, who, on the 6th of May, voted against the Second Reading of the Bill for Perpetuating Tithes in Ireland, by commuting them for a fixed charge on the land, and still recognizing them on that more permanent shape as the property of the Irish Church.

## ENGLAND.

Aglionby, H. A.	Buckingham, J. S.	Fielden, J.	Palmer, General
Attwood, T.	Davis, Colonel	Kennedy, A.	Pease, J.
Blamire, W.			

## SCOTLAND.

Oswald, R. A.

## IRELAND.

Baldwin, Dr.	Fitzgerald, T.	O'Callaghan, D.	Roche, W.
Barron, H. W.	Finn, W. F.	O'Connell, D.	Ruthven, E.
Barry, G. S.	Fitzgibbon, Hon. G.	O'Connell, M.	Ruthven, E. S.
Bellew, R. M.	Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connell, M.	Sullivan, R.
Blackney, W.	Fitzsimon, N.	O'Connell, C.	Sheil, R. L.
Blake, M. J.	Hayes, S. E.	O'Connor, Don	Talbot, J.
Butler, Colonel	Lynch, A. H.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Talbot, J. H.
Callaghan, D.	Lambert, H.	O'Reilly, W.	Vigors, N. A.
Chapman, M.	Martin, T.	O'Ferrall, M.	Walker, C. A.
Dobbin, L.	Nagle, Sir R.	Roche, D.	Wallace, T.
Evans, G.	O'Brien, C.		

TELLERS.—Ialor, P.—Ronayne, D.

## MINORITY OF 21,

Who, on Thursday, the 8th of May, at one o'clock in the morning, voted in favour of Mr. Berkeley's Bill, for the better regulation of letters and papers transmitted by the General Post.

Berkely, Hon. G.	Etwell, R.	Hutt, W.	Ruthven, E.
Baines, E.	Fitzsimon, N.	Hoskins, K.	Ruthven, E. S.
Buckingham, J. S.	Fleetwood, H.	Pease, J.	Thicknesse, R.
Brotherton, J.	Gully, J.	Phillipotts, J.	Young, G. F.
Chetwynd, Captain	Hardy, J.	Pryme, G.	

TELLERS.—Berkeley, C.—Wallace, R.

## MAJORITY OF 40,

Tellers included, who, on Thursday, the 8th of May, at two o'clock in the morning, voted for the Second Reading of Mr. Hardy's Bill, to repeal the penalties imposed by the 52d Geo. III., on any Assembly of more than twenty persons meeting with closed doors in any private house or unlicensed place for public worship.

Aglionby, H. A.	Dykes, H. B.	Hutt, W.	Pease, J.
Anew, Sir A.	Divett, J.	Harland, W.	Pryme, R.
Bowes, T.	Evans, W.	Hughes, H.	Plumptre, J.
Blake, M. J.	Forster, C.	Johnstone, A.	Seymour, Lord
Baines, E.	Fleetwood, W.	Jervis, J.	Thicknesse, R.
Brotherton, J.	Fenton, J.	Lister, E. C.	Talbot, J. H.
Briscoe, J.	Green, W.	Lloyd, J.	Verney, Sir H.
Buckingham, J. S.	Gully, J.	Morpeth, Lord	Wallace, R.
Childers, W.	Halcumb, J.	Martin, J.	Warburton, H.
Curtis, H.			

TELLERS.—Finch, G.—Hardy, J.

## MINORITY OF 15,

Tellers included, who, on the 8th of May, voted against the removal of those penalties on a meeting of more than twenty persons for religious worship.

Callander, J. H.	Potter, R.	Smith, Vernon	Wood, G. W.
Jeffrey, Hon. F.	Rice, Hon. T. S.	Sandford, A.	Wason, R.
Lefevre, C. S.	Ruthven, E.	Sandon, Lord	Young, G. F.
Philips, M.			

TELLERS.—Ridley, Sir M. W.—Lushington, Dr.

C. Whiting, Beaufort House, Strand.

THE  
**PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.**

SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1834.

**LORD ALTHORP'S DECLARATION TO THE DE-  
PUTATION FROM THE DISSENTERS.**

THE great importance which the question of a separation of Church and State is now beginning to assume, will fully justify our devoting a large portion of our space to the most prominent of the public proceedings connected with this question, and we have accordingly selected, for our present Number, an account of the audience given to the Dissenter's Deputation by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on Saturday last, at the Treasury, in Downing-street;—the declaration of the Lord Chancellor in favour of upholding the Established Church, as delivered on the morning of Monday last from the Woolsack;—and the proceedings of a great Public Meeting, advocating the separation of Church and State, which took place on the evening of the same day, Monday, at the London Tavern, we will give in the order of their occurrence—beginning with the first under our present head.

A Deputation from the United Committee of Dissenters waited upon Lord Althorp on Saturday, May 10, at twelve o'clock at noon, to state to his Lordship the views which the body they represented entertain of the Government measure of relief from the grievances under which they labour.

The Deputation consisted of the following Gentlemen and Ministers:—Mr. John Wilks, M. P.; Mr. Edward Baines, M. P.; Mr. Richard Ash, of Bristol; Mr. Samuel Clapham, of Leeds; the Rev. John Angell James, of Birmingham; Rev. Joseph Gilbert, of Nottingham; the Rev. Dr. Bedford, of Worcester; the Rev. R. Griffith, Long Buckley, Northamptonshire; James Baldwin Brown, LL.D.; Mr. Thomas Harbottle, of Manchester; Mr. Henry Waymouth, and Mr. Robert Hunter.

Mr. WILKS, having been previously acquainted with his Lordship, introduced the other Gentlemen individually, who stated the views of their several constituencies *seriatim*. They all concurred in stating that the measure of Government was regarded with the utmost dissatisfaction throughout the country.

His LORDSHIP expressed his great surprise and disappointment that the measure had not met with the approbation of the body for whose relief it was intended. He had never framed a measure since his accession to office which he thought more likely to prove satisfactory; and never had he brought in a measure to Parliament with greater satisfaction to himself.

Several MEMBERS of the Deputation again stated, that the representations they had made respecting the dissatisfaction which the measure created among Dis-

senters was not only correct, but that this dissatisfaction was universal, being shared alike by that body in all parts of the country.

Lord ALTHORP said, that the latter part of the statement again surprised him, as it was at variance with communications which he had received from quarters in which he could confide, from the county of Northampton, the county with which he was most intimately acquainted. The communications to which he referred most distinctly stated that the measure had given the greatest satisfaction in that county to all classes of Dissenters.

The Rev. R. GRIFFITHS, one of the Deputies of Northamptonshire, stated that here his Lordship was altogether misinformed, that he (Mr. Griffiths) was intimately acquainted with the state of feeling among the Dissenters in that county on the subject, and that the measure had given the greatest dissatisfaction there.

Lord ALTHORP, after again repeating the expression of his surprise and disappointment that the measure had not proved satisfactory to the Dissenters, and stating that he conceived the concessions made to that body were so liberal as ought to obtain their approval of the measure, said, that he would be inclined to give every attention to the representations which the Deputation had now made, coming as their statements did from the representatives of so respectable a body; but wished them distinctly to understand that he could not feel himself justified in holding out to them any hope of any other measure being brought forward on the subject by the Government.

The unanimous opinion of the Deputation, on hearing this announcement, was, that rather than accept so partial a measure, they would prefer the present state of things. They intimated this to his Lordship, who again expressed his regret that they were not satisfied with the measure. The interview then broke up, after having lasted upwards of an hour.

The UNITED COMMITTEE of Dissenters met on Monday last, at one o'clock in the afternoon, at Dr. Williams's Library, Redcross-street, to learn the result of the interview which the Deputation had with Lord Althorp on Saturday. The Resolution they came to, on the particulars being stated, was that of the Deputation themselves—namely, rather to continue as they were than to accept so partial and imperfect a measure as that proposed by Government.

They further agreed to recommend to all the LOCAL COMMITTEES and Congregations throughout the United Kingdom to get up and forward Petitions to Parliament immediately, praying for a far more liberal measure of relief than that of Government. The United Committee are to have a most energetic Petition on the subject, ready to be presented to Parliament on Thursday, and expect that those which will be forwarded from all parts of the country will be equally explicit and uncompromising in enforcing the claims of the Dissenters.

It was stated at the Meeting on Monday, by the several Deputations which had waited on Members of Parliament with the view of ascertaining the probable extent of support on which they could rely on this occasion from the House of Commons—that in the great majority of cases, those Members had expressed themselves *unwilling* and *afraid* to oppose the measure of Government, *IF* MINISTERS SHOULD THEREBY BE THROWN OUT OF OFFICE, but all concurred in acknowledging the great power, wealth, intelligence, numbers, and respectability of the Dissenters. They also acknowledged that the Government or Parliament could not long resist the union and determination of Dissenters, and expressed their fears of the issue, adding, that it was wholly impossible for Government to stand, if the Dissenters should desert it.

The UNITED COMMITTEE also referred to the question of a separation between Church and State. The feeling was almost unanimous in favour of such separation; but as there was a diversity of opinion among the Members as to the propriety of petitioning the Legislature in existing circumstances for the abolition of the union between Church and State, the understanding came to was, that the United Committee should not at present make that abolition part of the prayer of their Petition.

\* The necessity, however, of establishing voluntary Church Associations through

out the country, on precisely the same principle as those existing in Scotland, was more clearly seen and more sensibly felt by the Committee, in consequence of the result of the interview their Deputation had with Lord Althorp, and it is understood that such Associations will be forthwith formed without delay.

It is impossible not to be struck with the facts contained in this short report. The determination of the present Government to resist all further concessions to the Dissenters is publicly avowed. And yet, there are Members of Parliament so lightly valuing the great principle of religious liberty, that they consent to prolong a system of religious oppression, *lest Ministers should be thrown out of office!* What an avowal is this on the part of men calling themselves independent Members! It was well observed by Mr. Harvey, in the discussion on the Pension List, that it was most absurd to imagine that if the present Ministers retired from office, no men could be found in London ready and able to supply their places. But we will go further, and say, that if all London itself were swallowed up by an earthquake, or overwhelmed by the eruption of a volcano, like Herculaneum and Pompeii of old, it would be monstrous and absurd in the highest degree, to suppose that all the rest of England would be unable to furnish men of sufficient talent, experience, and integrity, to form a new Government for the country. Why, the present Ministers cannot live for ever; but must, in the course of nature, at some time not very remote, descend to the grave. Will any one presume to say, that England must *then* be without a Government, as no persons worthy to succeed them can be found? If fit and proper successors should be then available, why not *now*? One would think, to hear the Members who thus dread the consequences of Ministers losing office, that it required the greatest talents, and most consummate skill, to direct the affairs of state. If so, we should like to ask, how Lord Althorp could ever hope to conduct them—a person who would never be thought fit to be selected as the leader of any assembly in England, *except* the House of Commons—where his high birth, aristocratical connexions, and imperturbable suavity and good nature, are received as qualifications entitling him to direct the affairs of state; which he does in so imperfect and unsatisfactory a manner, that there is scarcely a measure proposed by him that is not either rejected by the country entirely, or so modified as it passes through the House that it is scarcely recognizable as the same measure. And this is a Minister whom Members dread to see removed from office, and for whose retention of place they are prepared to sacrifice their advocacy of one of the most important principles that men can ever be called on to defend—the sacred principle of civil and religious liberty—which is violated and overthrown by the existence of a dominant and privileged sect!

The conduct of the Dissenters forming the United Committee, appears to us scarcely less reprehensible. They were *unanimously* in favour of a separation of Church and State—in other words, they deemed the connexion between them unscriptural, impolitic, and injurious; and yet they hesitate as to the propriety of praying, under existing circumstances, for its dissolution. They think it ought to take place, but they will not, *at present*, press it in their petitions. We frankly confess that this appears to us as much a departure from principle as the conduct of the Parliamentary Members. The proper moment to seek for the abolition of an evil is the moment it is dis-



covered to be one; and we cannot understand the feelings of those who admit any thing to be unjust, and yet contend for delay in the removal of the injustice. But it has been thus with almost all great questions in England; and so it appears it will be in this. We have no hesitation, however, in expressing our decided conviction that the days of the Established Church, as a privileged and dominant Corporation, are numbered. The people of England have made the first step in advance towards putting all religious bodies on a footing of perfect equality, and they will not retrograde in their career. Whatsoever there is of Christianity in the Church will pass through the fiery ordeal and come out more pure than ever. Whatsoever there is in it of worldly feeling and ungodly gain, will be destroyed as dross that alloyed the purer metal; and if the *only* bond which attached its worshippers to the Church were the vital principle of its religious purity, they themselves, as well as all others, would rejoice at such a separation. If they dread it, it is because they are convinced it cannot stand alone; and in this respect they pass a much severer sentence on its character than those who are deemed its bitterest enemies.

#### ORIGIN AND NATURE OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

FOREIGN commerce arises out of imperfection in productive power. If a people could themselves produce, by their own labours, *directly*, all those articles of which they stand in need, or imagine they stand in need, as well as they can get them from a foreign country, there would be no foreign commerce. It is only because the articles can be procured on better terms *indirectly*, that is, by producing something else, exporting it, and bringing back the article wanted, that the circuitous routine of foreign commerce is resorted to. The benefit of it is, therefore, always realized in the article received, that which is exported being only the necessary means which must be used in order to obtain the import, which is the end. It follows, from this, that the less you export, and the more you import, the better; or, in other words, the dearer you sell, and the cheaper you buy, the greater benefit you receive: or, to express the same thing in quantities of labour, the smaller the quantity of labour expended in your exports, and the greater the quantity of labour saved in your imports, the better.—*Hopkins's Great Britain for the Last Forty Years.*

#### EFFECTS OF MACHINERY—HAND-LOOM WEAVERS.

FROM an examination of the results of machinery, it appears that all inventions for abridging labour and diminishing the cost of production, with the exception of those in which cattle are employed as the moving power, augment the funds for the maintenance of labour, and have the effect of increasing both maximum and actual wages. It also appears, that the general good which results from the employment of new and improved machinery is accompanied by partial evil. While the public acquires additional wealth, the individuals who are supplanted in their accustomed occupations are reduced to poverty. Humanity and justice demand, that those who thus suffer for the public good should be relieved at the public expense. Whenever a new application of mechanical power throws a particular class of operatives out of employment, a national fund should be provided, to aid them in betaking themselves to other occupations. It is a disgrace to the Legislature and to the country, that the numerous body of hand-loom weavers should have been left so long in misery and destitution, and toiling to the death in hopeless competition with the power-loom. A comprehensive plan for their relief should be one of the earliest measures of the reformed Parliament.—*Colonel Torrens.*

## SECOND READING OF THE BILL FOR AMENDING THE POOR LAWS.

ON Friday evening, the 9th of May, the discussion on the Second Reading of the New Poor Law Bill, occupied the attention of a very full House—about 350 members being present during the debate. From the length at which we recently reported the proceedings on the first introduction of this measure to the House, it will be unnecessary for us to enter largely into the question now. We will state, however, our own objections to several parts of the Bill, notwithstanding that we approve of its being passed through a second reading, leaving the details to be settled in Committee.

We hold the opinion, that every human being brought into existence, whether legitimately or illegitimately, possesses, as a part of the great human family, as clear a right to the necessary quantity of food and raiment to support a healthful subsistence, as to the requisite quantity of air for respiration. The great Creator of all has as much endowed him with his natural and physical appetites, as with an immortal soul; and neither should be suffered to perish for the want of its due share of nutriment and sustenance. When men are embarked on the ocean, and a certain number are confined in a ship, if the provisions and water fall short, as compared with the consumers, the justice of calling upon each to make a sacrifice of his own portion for the benefit of the whole is never disputed, and in any reduction of the allowance of food and water, it would be thought scandalous and inhuman for the officers not to submit to the same amount of reduction as the men. If, by picking up a ship's crew at sea, by taking them from a sinking vessel, the number of the consumers are doubled, and still further reductions are required, in that case also, all are called upon to make a proportionate sacrifice. In both these cases the line of conduct pursued is founded on the same great principle, namely, the *absolute right*, by the first law of nature, and the universal sense of justice, to subsistence, of which right no man can be justly deprived but for the commission of a crime which would warrant the putting him out of existence altogether.

That right being established, there are certain reciprocal duties or obligations by which its enjoyment should be regulated; and the consideration of these leads us to the discovery of the best mode of following out this great principle in all its details. The aged, the sick, and the infirm, who are unable to subsist themselves, and equally unable to give any thing in return for the cost of their subsistence to others, are entitled to the protection and support of the community, without any other condition than that of their actual helplessness, by whatever causes produced. The young, and healthy, and able-bodied, who suffer want merely because they are *unable*, however willing, to obtain

employment, are equally entitled to be fed and subsisted by the community, whenever their absolute inability to subsist themselves is proved; but they may be fairly bound in return to give to that community, from whom they derive their subsistence, the fair and reasonable return of such labour as their health, and strength, and skill will enable them to perform. A third class will be found who are not totally unable to provide for themselves, as the former, nor wholly without work, as the latter, and to whom, therefore, a slight addition to their existing means, and that, too, perhaps, continued for a short period, would be all that would be required.

It is clear, then, that for these three classes a very different sort of provision would be needed. For the first, asylums and hospitals, maintained at the expense of the country, so as to equalize the burden instead of pressing too severely on particular parishes. For the second, labour in public works should be devised, by competent directors, and these of decided public utility, in which there could be no difficulty whatever if set about with earnestness and determination. For the third, all that is wanted is a rigidly-searching examination into the circumstances of each particular case, and a due care in the administration of the parochial funds.

Now, for all these, we think the act of the 43d of Elizabeth, the original foundation of the Poor Laws, would amply provide, if its principles were carried out to their full extent, and a proper machinery of administration were selected. The abuses in this administration are not the *necessary* consequences of the act itself, but are capable, we think, of correction, without the great changes proposed by the present Bill. In this Bill we object, first, to the large, and unnecessary, and irresponsible power given to the Commissioners; secondly, to the making the settlement of the poor dependent on birth alone; thirdly, to the entire abolition of all out-door relief; and, fourthly, to what we think one of the most revolting and cruel provisions of the Bill—the making females alone suffer all the penalties of illicit intercourse—punishing with the utmost severity the weakest and always the least criminal of the parties, and suffering the seducer or the violator of female chastity to go wholly exonerated from blame.

These are very great and very serious objections:—but as we believe that each of them may be urged with more chance of success in the debate, in the several clauses when the Bill is in Committee, than in a discussion on the second reading, so we assented, in common with many others whose objections were equally strong with our own, to the Bill going through this stage: and shall accordingly wait the approach of that debate, when these objections will be urged.

The discussion of the evening was, on the whole, interesting. Colonel Evans opened the debate, by proposing a long resolution in opposition to the Bill, which was ultimately withdrawn. Sir Samuel Whalley followed, and in a most pompous and declamatory speech, which excited alternately the laughter and dissatisfaction of the House, urged all his objections to the measure with so much more force of manner than was at all required, that he overshot his mark, and made more converts to the Bill by repulsion, than allies to his opposition by attraction. He moved that the Bill should be read a second time that day six months: or in other words, that it should be rejected altogether,

and consequently, nothing be done in the matter this Session. Mr. Alderman Wood seconded the amendment.

Mr. Grote made a very temperate and well-reasoned speech in favour of the second reading, though disapproving of many parts of the Bill; and the impression made by its calmness, modesty, and force, when contrasted with the noisy pomp, self-exaltation, and inefficiency of that which preceded it, was very striking. The speech embodies our own views, and those of many others, so completely, that we give it entire.

Mr. GROTE addressed the house as follows: I rise, Sir, to express my hope that the house will read this bill a second time, and suffer it to go into committee. (Hear, hear.) Approving as I do of almost all its main ends—approving as I do also, to a great degree and for the most part, of the new machinery by which those ends are proposed to be accomplished, and convinced as I am fully, that some new machinery is absolutely and indispensably requisite, I hope the house will not refuse to examine this bill in committee. This is a subject on which I feel a strong and anxious interest, and had I been left to my own unaided judgment and knowledge of the case, I should still have entertained a strong persuasion that some measure of this kind was indispensably requisite. But I feel the more confirmed in my opinion on this occasion, because this measure has been preceded by a careful and copious inquiry, the details of which are before the public. (Hear, hear.) That inquiry I have consulted with great pains and care. The hon. gentleman who preceded me states that he does not believe that any one has read the one-hundredth part of the evidence and reasonings published by the commissioners. This is at least a proof of their diligence. But I may state that I have perused with deliberate attention, not only the general report of the commissioners, but their appendix A., which contains the report of the assistant-commissioners; and I must say that the details of abuse, as they are set forth in those reports, appalling as they are in their character, widely spread throughout most parts of England, afflicting and ruinous to the rate-payer, and hurtful and demoralizing to the last degree to the labouring classes—I must say that those details demonstrate in the fullest manner the necessity for a large and comprehensive remedy, such as the present measure professes to be and approaches to. (Hear, hear.)

I shall not weary the house by reading details from that report, which would attest the magnitude of the abuse; but there is one fact, capable of being shortly and plainly stated, which will convey to them some conception of the extent of the existing abuse. The house are aware that the real and genuine object of the poor laws is to furnish comfortable shelter for the aged and infirm, and to provide work for able-bodied persons who cannot procure employment. Now, the aggregate expenditure on the poor laws for the year ending March, 1832, was 7,036,000*l.* What proportion of this sum does the house imagine to have been employed in setting labourers to work for the parish? The total amount so employed was no more than 354,000*l.*, less than 1-20th of the whole. So much for the extent of abuse as regards the expenditure. But this vast and abusive expenditure, ruinous as it is to those who pay it, and weighing them down to the ground in addition to so many other burdens, is, in my mind, as dust in the balance (hear, hear);—it is as nothing, compared with the evil effect of the poor laws as now administered on the character and comfort of the labouring classes. (Hear.) The sobriety, the industry, and the independence of the labouring classes are the first of blessings to a country, and the dearest of all objects to every virtuous citizen. (Hear, hear.) Now every page of the reports of the assistant-commissioners teems with evidence that the poor laws throughout most parts of England are so administered as to corrupt and degrade the labourers to the last degree, to afford a premium on idleness and improvidence, and to place in the worst and most destitute condition the most deserving characters—those labourers who worked the hardest, and who deferred the period of marriage from an anxious desire to maintain their independence. Men of this last character are repudiated and driven from employment, and reduced to the lowest vantage.

How can the morality of the labourers resist such mischievous dealing as this? If it be suffered to continue, what is there to prevent them from being all gradually debased and demoralized by the withering influence of pauperism? (Hear.) When I read such a catalogue of evils as this, I ask myself whether it be possible to escape from them without some large and comprehensive alteration of the defective system under which they have grown up. It seems to me totally and absolutely impossible; and therefore it is that I call upon the house to read this bill a second time, in order that its provisions and details may be carefully considered in committee. It makes a great and grave change in our poor law administration—it creates new authorities and new powers; but, in my opinion, not at all earlier than such a change was called for. (Hear, hear.)

There are some of the powers conferred by this bill to which I myself object, and others for which I as yet see no sufficient reason. I see strong objections to the power granted of committing for contempt of the board, and to the sweeping powers granted for summoning witnesses: I object likewise to the power granted of uniting parishes contrary to the declared sense of the inhabitants. But all these objections are in my view fit subjects for consideration in committee, and there only. I am quite aware that much jealousy has been expressed on the subject of the great and novel powers proposed to be vested in the commissioners. I cannot wonder that it should be so, for it is perfectly natural that apprehensions should be entertained when any new and comprehensive authority, not sanctioned by previous habit, is proposed to be created. But the real question for the house to consider is, not whether the powers of the commissioners are great, but whether they are greater than the urgency of the case requires. This is the real question for the house to determine:—First, are not the objects proposed to be carried into effect by this bill not merely wise and salutary, but of imperious necessity and overwhelming importance? Secondly, if these ends are good and necessary, can they be accomplished without the species and extent of authority, and the new and peculiar agency, which this bill confers? Perhaps it may be shown in committee that some of the portions of authority which the bill confers are not essential to the objects aimed at, and therefore may be safely withheld. This will be matter for grave deliberation in each particular clause wherein the separate powers are enumerated. But I would earnestly entreat the house to keep in mind that general declamations on the despotic power of the commissioners really avail little towards the merits of this question—that they serve at best only to disturb the calmness and sobriety of mind which its vast and momentous character call for, and that to expect the extirpation of an inveterate abuse, while we leave without correction or redress the defective administration from whence it has sprung, is no less chimerical than it would be to expect grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles.

But though I am far from denying that the powers of the commissioners are very large, such as nothing but urgent necessity can justify, yet I am bound to say that I think they have been supposed to be much greater than the bill really sanctions. For instance, it has been sometimes argued as if all parochial vestries and authorities were to be altogether abrogated by this bill. This is not at all the case. The parochial vestry still subsists; it still levies all the moneys collected in the parish; it still issues all the disbursements, subject in certain definite points to the concurrent authority or superintending control of the commissioners. But, above all, it exists as a local point of appeal and protection, against any misuse of authority by the commissioners. If the commissioners make any regulations which annoy or oppress the parish—still more, if any exercise of their authority should fall hardly or cruelly upon individuals, the vestry will serve as a rallying point for all well-grounded discontent. Entertaining a strong and decided opinion upon this subject, I have done my best to persuade the house to read this bill a second time. I know that I have done this at no small risk of favour and popularity to myself; for I understand that a petition was this day presented from my own constituents, directed strongly against the passing of this bill. Sir, it is not without the deepest regret and concern that I find myself opposed to constituents to whom I am attached by every tie, and to whom I owe the honourable station which I now occupy; but so strong is my conviction of the

absolute necessity of some large remedial measure as an antidote to the overwhelming evil of pauperism—so firm is my belief of the necessity of some central supervising agency to secure the fulfilment of any salutary provisions which the Legislature may prescribe—so strong is my conviction on these cardinal points, that if it were to cost me the certain sacrifice of my seat, I should feel bound to tell my constituents that I dissented from them, and that I would do my best to promote the attainment of this necessary and in the main valuable remedy. (Hear, hear.) In doing so, I should feel with pain that I had decided contrary to the opinion of my constituents, but I should also feel that I had decided in unison with the best interests of my country. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Slaney and Mr. Clay both supported the measure, of which each of them highly approved. Sir Francis Burdett would vote for the second reading, in the hope of being able to effect many alterations in the Committee; and mentioned, as a fact, that in the unreformed Parliament, a Bill was brought in by Mr. Curwen, whose name the act now bears, which was so altered in the Committee, that not more than a few lines of the original Bill survived its passing through that wholesome and searching ordeal. Mr. Richards supported the Bill, though also objecting to some of its provisions. Mr. E. Buller made a very curious speech, which left many in doubt whether he was for or against the measure, the different parts of his speech appearing alternately to justify and to condemn it: and leaving all in doubt which sentiment, that of approbation or condemnation, predominated. Mr. Walter made the strongest speech against it: and as it is short, it may be given, as a balance to Mr. Grote's.

Mr. WALTER said that it was impossible to conceal the fearful importance of the present measure, any more than its anomalous and unprecedented character. It was an attempt, not to alter or improve, but to abolish at one stroke the whole body of our poor-laws, and to substitute another, totally different, in principle and practice, in their place. The general usage in this country had been to correct abuses, to remove pressures, to strengthen infirm parts, and so by a system or succession of expedients our laws had grown up to their present form and consistency. He confessed that he dreaded, and his constituents were also beginning to dread, this new made constitution, for such it must be considered, for the poor, and for every parish in the kingdom. He said that people attained rights by long and unbroken enjoyment; and the poor of this country had rights, many of which they had lost, as the right of commonage, by the indiscriminate rage for enclosures. The right of maintenance and employment still remained to them under the old constitution by which they had been governed; and if injured, if their rights were violated, they were within reach of those to whom, by their voices, they could complain of that violation. But by this new constitution their rights were to be removed from their old basis, and placed on a totally different foundation; and that foundation would not be within their reach, but placed in London, in a central board or commission. (Hear.) A certain Abbé at the beginning of the French revolution was said to have had constitutions of every kind, which he could take out of the pigeon-holes of his bureau. This certainly was not one of his constitutions for there had never been any legal provision for the poor in France; but it resembled them; for it had no connexion with any thing that ever existed before in the habits of people to whom it was meant to be applied, no analogy with any of their preceding laws, nothing congenial with their modes of thinking; it came out of the pigeon-hole of some theorist's brain, and had been supported before it was offered to that house by a partial examination of individuals and a series of leading questions. He hoped the measure would not be persevered in, or, if persevered in, that it would not be carried forward without the most measured consideration and the universal assent of the nation, if that could be obtained. A copy of the bill should be laid on every vestry table. Other circumstances, connected with the measure, were the appalling expense and ramified patronage with which it even started. What it might be in the issue, heaven alone knew. He

thought that under a reformed Parliament there was to be a saving of expenses and a diminution of patronage. By this bill there would be a mass of patronage created, of commissioners, sub-commissioners, clerks, and guardians; and an expense incalculable, for the first estimate rarely sufficed for one single and definite object; and who could conceive the expense of a system which it was meant should continue for ever? He should certainly vote for the postponement of the bill till next session, if the hon. member divided the house; and should suggest that His Majesty's Ministers should direct their energies for the present to an amendment of the laws of settlement and of bastardy (hear)—of the former, by a very different provision from that which appeared in the bill, by which a man in his old age, should he have fallen into misfortune, might be transported to the place of his birth, which he might never have seen from his infancy. (Hear.) In these two objects there was enough to engage their attention, and that of the house, during the present session; and such a course would be more in accordance with the usual practice of legislation in this country, to remedy evils singly, rather than to body forth new forms and constitutions.

Mr. Hume spoke strongly in support of the measure generally, and urged no objections to any part of it. Mr. Bennett was opposed to many parts of the Bill, though he would vote for the second reading. Mr. Hawes suggested some appeal against the decrees of the Commissioners. Mr. Brotherton would also support the Bill, though he thought out-door relief could not be done away with in manufacturing districts, and though he considered the power given to the Commissioners to be much too large.

Not less than twenty Members had risen in the course of the evening to speak on the question, but could not obtain a hearing, as, of course, only one *can* be heard at once, though fifty candidates for the Speaker's eye should rise at the same time. This disappointment occurs to some one or other every night. On the discussion of the Pension List we were on our legs six times during the evening; but as there were always five or six candidates equally entitled to a hearing, and one only could be named by the Speaker, we were content to take our fair chance with the rest. To night, however, there were more disappointments than usual, from there being so many in the House who felt that they voted contrary to the wishes of their constituents, and who were therefore anxious to say something in explanation or justification of their votes.

As it drew near midnight, however, Lord Althorp was called for on all sides; and he rose to close the debate, by replying generally to some of the objections thrown out by preceding speakers, but at the same time disarming opposition from many, by expressing his entire readiness to adopt in the Committee any suggestions of improvement compatible with the efficiency of the Bill, which was not a party measure, nor one exclusively supported by the friends of Government, and would therefore be fairly open to discussion and improvement through all its subsequent stages.

After a short speech from Sir James Scarlett, who would vote for the second reading, though he, too, like Sir Francis Burdett, objected to a large portion of the Bill, a division was called for, when the numbers appeared—For the second reading, 319; Against it, 20 only. The announcement of the numbers was received with loud cheering.

## LORD BROUGHAM'S DEFENCE OF THE UNION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

---

ONE of the many remarkable events of the day, is the exhibition of the Lord Chancellor, Henry Brougham, in his new character of "Defender of the Faith"—a title as fit to be bestowed on him in future times, as it was bestowed on his namesake, Henry the Eighth, the great Reformer, in his day of the abuses of the Church.—That disinterested monarch thought that the corruptions of the Papal Establishment should be corrected, but that the Establishment itself should still exist under a new name. And the present equally disinterested Chancellor, conceives that the smaller grievances of which the Dissenters complain, should be redressed, but that the master grievance of all, the existence of a privileged and dominant Church should be still continued!

A petition from Glasgow, signed by 48,600 persons, praying for a separation between the Church and the State, had been intrusted to Lord Brougham, for presentation to the House of Lords. The petition emanated from a Public Meeting held on the 6th of March last, in Glasgow; the requisition for calling which meeting was signed by 272 respectable householders; and the resolutions on which the petition was grounded, passed unanimously at the Meeting. In the last Session, a similar petition had been presented from the same town, and on the same subject; but that petition contained only 15,000 signatures: so that the number of the petitioners had increased in the interval as to be more than treble the former amount. This petition was presented to the House of Peers by Lord Brougham, in the early sitting of Monday last, May 12; and in the speech which his lordship delivered on that occasion, we find the following passages:

He need not remind their Lordships—he need not inform the petitioners, that there was no individual in either House of Parliament, or without the walls of Parliament, who entertained or expressed more uniformly than he did a consistent and zealous friendship to the principle of religious toleration in its fullest extent, without any qualification as to sect, condition, or description of men (hear), to the full extent of that great principle, that *no man ought to be injured, or in any way affected, in the possession or enjoyment of any of his civil rights, by the circumstance of his differing from other men in matters of religious opinion.* This was the principle which he had acted upon in the other House of Parliament, and since he had a seat in this House, and he would fain hope that within these few years that principle had taken a wider and deeper root, and that it would speedily produce the fruit of entire and unqualified TOLERATION. (Hear.) But although, imbued with and acting upon this principle, he went along with the first portion of the prayer of this petition, yet, with respect to the residue, he had stated to the deputation that had waited upon him, in what it was he did not coincide—namely, in that part of it in which the petitioners asked that their Lordships would take measures to *dissolve* what they in their petition styled the UNJUST, UNSCRIPURAL, AND INJURIOUS CONNEXION BETWEEN CHURCH AND



STATE. This form of expression which of late time had crept into political rather than religious discussion, was of an *indefinite* and *not very accurate* kind; but taking it to mean, not the dissolution of the connexion between Church and State, of which phrase he *confessed that he did not entirely comprehend the meaning*, but taking it to mean the dissolution of the Established Church—that there should not be any longer any Established Church at all—that the principle of what was called a voluntary Church should be substituted for it—that the State should not provide in any way whatever for its support—that neither by annuity, nor taxes, nor tithes, should the State provide the means of affording religious instruction to the people; but that all sects and descriptions of men, the ignorant and the uninstructed, as well those who were so ignorant that they did not know the value of instruction as those who, from better information, were aware of its use—that all should be left to provide religious instruction for themselves, so that, as it were, every man should be a church for himself, or every set of men a church for themselves. To that extent he could not accord with the petitioners. He expressed his entire, and, he was afraid, INCURABLE difference of opinion, and, holding that difference of opinion, he confessed that he looked with *alarm*, not with anxiety alone, but with ALARM and DISMAY, to a state of things which *must* be the consequence of granting that portion of the prayer of the petition—for the abolition of all hierarchies whatever; for it extended to the Church of Scotland, that economical church, as well as to the Church in Ireland, which was far less economical in its disposition—as he was SURE that this state of things would leave TWENTY MILLIONS OF HIS FELLOW SUBJECTS WITHOUT ANY REGULAR ESTABLISHED MEANS OF OBTAINING RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

Now, the Dissenters *are* injured, and *are* affected in the enjoyment of their civil rights by the very existence of any dominant sect. It is one of the clearest and dearest of civil rights, that no man shall be taxed except by his own consent, conveyed through his representative in Parliament, and for which some equivalent benefit shall be received in return. By the five millions a-year of national property devoted to the support of an Established Church, which is at present wholly independent of Parliamentary appropriation or control—five millions more of taxes are raised from the whole community than would be necessary if this national property were appropriated to the general purposes of the State, and therefore every forced contributor to this extra fund is in so far injured and affected in the enjoyment of his civil rights; besides which, instead of receiving any equivalent benefit in return for his contribution, the Dissenter justly considers himself to be forcibly made instrumental to the support of what he deems an evil—and which he would rather therefore pay to abolish than pay to support. Lord Brougham may talk of TOLERATION, and think it a great favour towards the Dissenters that they are *permitted* to exist (for this is the only true meaning of the word tolerated, as it implies a right, as well as a power, *not* to permit, or suffer, or allow); but this phrase will soon begin to receive a very different application, and the question will be, whether an Established Church shall be *tolerated* any longer, or if tolerated, whether it shall be *endured* that those who dissent from its doctrines and its forms, shall be made to pay for its support.

The Chancellor, who is one of the most acute and clear-sighted men of the age, when no sinister interests stand in the way of his vision, though he can see all things else so clearly, and has a quickness that makes him often seize men's meaning before they have half uttered their sentences, is in the present instance so dull, that he thinks the expression of “dissolving the unjust, unscriptural, and injurious connexion between Church and State,” so indefinite, or so inaccurate,

that he confesses he does not entirely comprehend its meaning. Alas! for the sagacity of the Lord Chancellor, the keeper of the King's conscience, the guardian of all the lunatics and orphans in the kingdom, the patron of the London University, the president of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, the Speaker of the House of Peers, the judge in the last appeal of all difficult controverted cases of law and equity in the land. Alas! we say, for the mighty intellect and master-mind of this highly gifted and highly elevated individual, if he has become all at once so dull of intellect as not clearly to comprehend what is really meant by dissolving the connexion between Church and State. He would find many a shepherd among the Highland glens—many a weaver in the Lowland towns—and many a parish schoolmaster in every part of his native country, Scotland, who would instruct him on this very easily intelligible matter—but that his Lordship thinks his opinion INCURABLE on this subject, as most opinions are that are grounded on considerations of interest, though none can be so considered that are open to reason, unless the party entertaining them deems himself infallible. This, too, would account for his Lordship looking not merely with anxiety, but with *alarm* and *dismay* at the progress of opinions calculated to affect those interests; for there can be no doubt that a separation of the Church from the State would go far to annihilate the political influence of that aristocracy of which Lord Brougham is now a member; and that those who, in the language of Lord Grey, were “determined to stand by their order,” would have the mortification to see that “order” shorn of a large portion of their political power, if the extensive patronage of the Church appointments, from bishops down to curates, were taken from the hands of the State, and exercised, as it ought to be, by the respective congregations.

The most extraordinary declaration of all, however, is that in which Lord Brougham has said, that if the Church of England were dissevered from the State, and put exactly on the same footing as the Dissenting sects (and no one wishes to see them put lower), he was sure that this state of things would leave TWENTY MILLIONS of his fellow-subjects without any means of obtaining religious instruction whatever. Can any thing be more remote from the truth than this? Why, the whole population of the United Kingdom is but TWENTY-FIVE MILLIONS, according to the latest census. Of these there are, at least, SEVEN MILLIONS in Ireland, who, being Roman Catholics, derive no religious instruction at present from the Church of England. In Scotland there are not less than THREE MILLIONS of Dissenters, who derive no religious instruction from either the Church of England or the Church of Scotland. In England there are at least SIX MILLIONS of Dissenters, including all denominations, who derive no religious instruction at present from the Church Establishment. Here, then, is an aggregate of sixteen millions out of twenty-five, who would not suffer in the slightest degree by the change. Of the remaining nine millions belonging to the Church of England, what is the present condition, as it regards religious instruction? We will answer this question in the language of an official report, read on the same day that Lord Brougham delivered his speech in the House of Peers, namely, Monday last, the 12th instant, when a Meeting was held at Exeter Hall, at which we were present, and took part in the proceedings to

celebrate the nineteenth anniversary of the British and Foreign School Society, and to receive the report of its progress. Lord John Russell was in the chair, and several members of both houses of Parliament were present, as well as Ministers of the Church and of Dissenting bodies; and in the presence of an immense assembly of from 2000 to 3000 persons of the highest respectability, and of both sexes, the following statement was read from the official report, by the Secretary, Mr. Dunn.

The Committee rejoiced that a sum of money, 20,000*l.*, was placed at the disposal of his Majesty, by a grant from Parliament, for the erection of Schools. By the public meetings held in the various towns throughout the Empire, a sum of 29,383*l.* had been obtained towards defraying the expenses of the schools. (Lord John Russell stated that no less than 60,000*l.* had been subscribed by private individuals in augmentation of this parliamentary grant—making the whole, therefore, 80,000*l.*) The Report then alluded to the various places in England where schools have been established, embracing Redruth (in Cornwall), Durham, Blackburn, Oldham, Sedgley (in Staffordshire), Stafford, Sheerness, Chudleigh (in Devon), Torrington, Devon, &c. &c., in several of which the large populations were in a state of *great ignorance*, and in some of which *THREE-FOURTHS OF THE POPULATION COULD NEITHER READ NOR WRITE*. At Sheerness it continued, with a population of 7000, there was *only one school*; and such was the want of education there, that the *WORKMEN* in the dock-yards subscribed 250*l.* towards the erection and establishment of schools on the Society's plan, in shares of 15*s.* each. (Cheers.) In Chudleigh, the poor offered to subscribe *one penny a week* towards a school; and in Cornwall, the *mining labourers*, having but twelve shillings a week wages, subscribed and made up a *voluntary* contribution of *SIXTY POUNDS*, which they presented to the Society. (Much applause.)

Here then is a picture of what the Church Establishment does in the way of "religious instruction." It has a revenue of 5,000,000*l.* sterling—in tithes, endowments, and rates, to maintain an indolent and inefficient clergy, and it does so *little* with all this vast wealth—more than the entire revenue of England not many years ago—in the way of religious instruction, that it leaves large masses of the population in so deplorable a state of ignorance, that *THREE-FOURTHS OF THEM CAN NEITHER READ NOR WRITE*, so that their very ignorance—(the bitterest censure that can be cast upon the Church Establishment) is made an argument for appealing to the generosity of the Parliament and the charity of the people, from which a further sum of 80,000*l.*, 20,000*l.* from Parliament, and 60,000*l.* from the public, is raised to remedy the evil. This is the care which the Established Church bestows on the "religious instruction" of the people.

Let us look for a moment at the other side of the picture. It is this: In the first place, while many of the country churches are almost deserted, the Dissenting Meeting-houses are filled to overflowing. While churches are lessening in number and falling into decay, new chapels, erected by voluntary contributions, are springing up in every direction. To almost every Dissenting place of worship is attached a Sunday-school, which is filled with scholars, and the greatest pains are taken to see that the children of Dissenters are every where well instructed, as well as morally trained. In Wales, the number of children taught by Dissenting Sunday-schools, has increased tenfold within the last four years, while the number taught by the Established Church has either remained stationary or declined, and in some places the schools of the Establishment have disappeared altogether.

Can Lord Brougham be ignorant of these facts? It is impossible!

His labours, when a member of the House of Commons' inquiry into the abuses of Public Charities, and the misappropriation of the funds endowed on Public Schools, must have made him acquainted with these general truths; and then, we believe, he did not think quite so highly of the Established Church, nor were his opinions so *incurable* as to the necessity of maintaining its connexion with the State. But he has been since elevated to the peerage—he is now one of the privileged aristocracy; he may feel bound, like Lord Grey, “to stand by his order;” and in that, and in that alone, can we find any solution of the mystery of his present declarations.

But we must pass from the noble and learned lord on the woolsack to his venerable and right reverend ally, the chief Hierarchy of the Church on the Episcopal Bench. Henry Brougham, suffering under the eulogies and support of the Archbishop of Canterbury, is something new at least. We give an extract from the speech of the “Right Reverend Father in God,” to use the modest title by which the prelates of the Established Church are designated.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY said, that if the petitioners had confined themselves to the civil grievances under which they might labour, he should not have made any observation on the petition, as he was one of those who were willing to remove all the practical civil grievances of the Dissenters; but the petition contained a prayer which, consistently with his duty and attachment to the church, he could not support, or allow to pass unnoticed. (Hear.) Indeed, the proposition in itself was so wild, that he could not conceive how such respectable and intelligent persons as he understood the parties petitioning to be, could think of sanctioning it. The dissemination of our pure and holy religion, through the whole country was the highest duty of the legislature. It had been most JUSTLY and ABLY stated by the noble and learned lord, that religion was not felt by the many as one of those pressing wants, such as hunger, the satisfaction of which would be hunted after till effected. Religious instruction was a happiness which the people could not procure for themselves; it must be, therefore, provided for them, and by none could it be *more amply* provided than by the Ministers of the Church. In some great and wealthy towns, possibly, churches might continue to be attended as well as at present, even were the prayer of the petition granted: but what were the poor spread over the greater part of the country to do if no religious instruction were provided for them? (Hear, hear!) There was naturally a desire for religious instruction in the minds of men; and when people could not get *sound* religious instruction—when no system of *pure* faith was presented to them, they would resort to the ministrations of teachers who preached *erroneous doctrines*—they would, in fact, embrace a religious system as *bad* as would be the *want of religion altogether!* This was a view of the question which it was of great importance to take in connexion with that of religious establishments. Correct views of Divine truth constituted the life of Christianity. It was great presumption to say that religious truth could be *discovered* without a revelation from Heaven; and it was an equally erroneous notion to pretend that the truth could be *preserved from the corruption of error* without the aid of an Established Church. The question, therefore, of whether there ought or ought not to be a religious establishment, was one which was not only of great importance to the present generation, but it was also of the highest moment to posterity. Had there been no religious establishment—he did not say the present Established Church, but one tantamount to it—from all ages, where, he would ask their lordships, would *Christianity* have now been? Where would have been the power or capacity of *discovering true doctrines from those which are false?* How could mankind, in such a case, have decided between the multitudinous sects which now exist, and all claiming to teach exclusively the true religion of Christ? The Established Church made provision for the supposed cases. It was to an Established Church, even in the most corrupt ages of the church, that we were to ascribe the *preservation of the records of Divine truth.*

It was consequently for the advantage of Dissenters themselves that an Establishment did exist. With respect to the voluntary church system, of which so much had lately been said, let Dissenters, before wishing to force it on others, see how it answered on themselves. Wherever the system was in operation, it would be found to have failed in producing the effects ascribed to it. It would be found that in every such case there existed complaints of the principle not being sufficiently supported. Their chapels were not properly supported, nor were their ministers sufficiently paid.

We really know not which to admire most, the speech of the Lord Chancellor, or the speech of the Archbishop. This at least may be said in praise of the latter, which cannot be conceded to the former, that it is in unison with the whole tenour of his former life and opinions, and therefore deserves the praise of sincerity and consistency, to which the other can have no just claim. But let us examine the extract a little in detail. *First*—it is said that religious instruction could not be *more amply* provided for the people than by the Established Church; and yet it is seen that this *ample* provision is so miserably scanty as to leave in some counties *three-fourths* of the labouring population unable to read; so that to them at least the Bible must be for ever a sealed book; and yet they are called upon to understand and believe its contents as the necessary condition of their future salvation. *Secondly*—it is said that the Church could alone give *sound* instruction, or *pure* faith; and that all else is so erroneous, as to be as bad as having no religion whatever! How the Dissenters will relish this we do not know; but most persons will ask—Who gave a patent of infallibility to the Church of England? Not the great Head of the Christian Faith, the Saviour; for he gave pre-eminence to no Church whatever. Not the Pope of Rome; for the Established Church of England denied his infallibility, and protested against any interference with the right of private judgment. Yet this Protestant Establishment, itself formed of Dissenters from the Church of Rome, after denying the infallibility of the Papal Church, now sets up an infallibility of its own, proclaims its own doctrines as the only true and pure faith, and condemns all others as so heretical and so pernicious as to be as bad as infidelity and Atheism itself! *Thirdly*—it is contended, that had there been no Established Church—that is, privileged and protected in a monopoly by the State—Christianity itself would have been extinguished; for what else can be the meaning of the question, “Had there been no State Establishment, where would *Christianity* have now been?” We had thought that Christianity was founded on a much firmer basis than this; and so, we believe, will most of our readers conceive. The Archbishop says, in effect, that the Church—and the Church alone—has the power of distinguishing true doctrines from false; that consequently what it declares to be true *is* true; and what it pronounces to be false *is* false;—that it adheres itself to what it deems true; and that all who do not belong to its communion, or subscribe to its creed, are believers in that which is false!—a doctrine which will find little favour in the eyes of Dissenters. *Fourthly*—the preservation of the Records of Divine Truth are ascribed entirely to the care of the Established Church. This cannot of course be meant to apply to the *original* records in their manuscript state, for these the Church has *not* preserved, but they have long since perished. It must mean of course that to the Esta-

blished Church alone must be ascribed the preservation of those transcripts or copies, written or printed, which have come down to our times. What then is the fact in this particular? Why that the Established Church of England, before the reign of Henry the Eighth, which was then a Roman Catholic Church, prohibited the use or perusal of those records to any but the clergy; that even after the Protestants had become Dissenters from the Church of Rome, the Scriptures could be read only by those who could understand Hebrew, Greek, or Latin; and that it was not until the reign of James, that it was translated into the English language. Since then, the facility of obtaining copies of the Scriptures, and the habit of exercising the right of private judgment, has led to a more rapid extension of genuine religion than any other causes had before produced; and thousands and tens of thousands of sincere and devout Christians in the humblest ranks of society are now as competent to read the inspired Volume, and to distinguish the true doctrines from those which are false, as any of "the Right Reverend Fathers in God" themselves. Indeed it would be insulting to its Divine Author to suppose otherwise; for this would warrant the monstrous supposition, that he had commanded all men to believe in its contents, and yet made them unintelligible without the aid of a highly paid and privileged interpreter. *Lastly*—the archbishop says that the voluntary principle of the Dissenters has wholly failed, and that their chapels are not properly supported, nor their Ministers sufficiently rewarded. This only betrays the noble Prelate's excessive, and we must add inexcusable ignorance. But how should they who live only in palaces, and visit only at court, know what is passing in the hamlet and the village? The history of every county in England will belie this most erroneous statement, and in its progress through the provinces of England it will receive a thousand contradictions.

There is but one passage more to which we will refer, before we conclude this article. Lord Brougham first asserted, that though there were some wants, such as hunger and thirst, which men might be safely left to themselves to supply, as the sufferings they occasioned would stimulate the sufferers to obtain the means of satisfying them; yet, as it respected education or religious instruction, it was a different matter: for the poor and uninstructed being insensible of its value, would never make any exertions or sacrifices to procure it for themselves, and therefore it must be provided for them by the State or the Church, or else they would never of their own accord either seek or secure it. This sentiment was praised and re-echoed by the Archbishop, as though he thought it unanswerable. But what said the Report of the British and Foreign School Society, read in the presence of the immense assembly at Exeter Hall, on the morning of the same day, and founded on undeniable evidence? Why this: that the very poorest classes were so sensible of the importance of instruction, that the common workmen in the dockyards of Sheerness in Kent, subscribed their shillings to build a school, and pay teachers in that town; that at Chudleigh, in Devonshire, the poor subscribed their penny a-week for a similar object; and that the mining labourers in Cornwall, receiving only twelve shillings a-week as wages, had raised by a voluntary subscription among themselves, no less a sum than 60*l.*, which they presented to the Society, in aid of the object of General Education! These facts are a sufficient refutation of the assertions of the reverend Prelate, and the learned Lord, and prove

how grossly ignorant they must each be of the real state of feeling among the humbler classes, if they each believe what they themselves assert.

It may be mentioned as a curious illustration of the manner in which public men are guided by expediency in adopting or rejecting certain principles, according to the circumstances in which they are found convenient or otherwise, that on a very recent occasion, Lord Brougham objected to any national system of Education being sustained from the public funds of the country, because he thought it would abridge the exercise of the voluntary principle, which he deems much better, and quite sufficient to do all that is required : while now, he contends that the voluntary principle can not be relied on, and therefore it is necessary to have a State Establishment for religious instruction. At the Meeting of the British and Foreign School Society at Exeter Hall, we took occasion, in a speech prefacing an amendment to one of the resolutions, to speak of the late Parliamentary grant of 20,000*l.* in support of General Education, as a valuable recognition of the duty of the Government to assist in promoting the instruction of the people, but expressed a hope that a still larger sum would be granted to meet the increasing demands for Public Instruction ; and Lord John Russell, like Lord Brougham on a former occasion, then expressed his fears that any extensive Government aid would damp the exercise of the voluntary principle, which he thought might safely be trusted to, as the most powerful agent of general support. And yet, when the proposition is made to let the Church depend on the voluntary principle for its support, Lord John Russell is ready to join Lord Brougham in taking the opposite side of the argument, and contending that without an Established Church, supported by the funds of the State, the religious instruction of the people would be inadequately secured !

This substitution of expediency for principle—this blowing hot and cold with the same breath—may serve a temporary purpose, but it cannot produce any enduring effect for good ; and it requires no great foresight to perceive, that unless fixed and unerring principles be laid down as the future rule of Government, and these adhered to with steadiness and fidelity, neither the present Administration, nor any following in its vacillating and wavering footsteps, can long retain the confidence of the country—without possessing which, no Government can or ought to exist.

#### MANUFACTURERS, LANDOWNERS, AND CAPITALISTS IN ITALY.

ITALY was, in the fourteenth century, the greatest manufacturing country in Europe ; and, it is very probable, that an advance in the rent of land stimulated manufactures in that, as it has recently done in this country. But, at last, rent was carried to so great a height as not merely to place the landowners decidedly above the capitalists, but to make them almost the only opulent and really influential part of the community ; and all political power and honours being placed in their hands, the other classes were treated as inferior orders. The capitalists then being unable to obtain distinction, respect, or even security, either left the country, or lost the appetite for accumulation, and manufactures and commerce declined.—*Hopkins's Great Britain for the last Forty Years.*

## PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS IN THE COMMUNICATION AND CONVEYANCE ON ROADS.

---

A PAMPHLET, inscribed to His Majesty's Ministers, has just been published by Messrs. Cochrane and M'Crone, Waterloo-place; entitled a "Proposal for a Government Consolidation of the Post-office, Roads, and Locomotive Conveyance, whereby taxes and poor-rates may be reduced, food cheapened, labour increased, and capital distributed." The object of the pamphlet is to call the attention of Parliament and the country to this important subject previous to Mr. Wallace's motion upon the Post-office, which now stands for the 6th of June, in the hope that if a Committee is granted, it may embrace the subject of Roads and Locomotive Conveyance also. From the Scotch papers we perceive that steam-carriage communication between Glasgow and Paisley, is considered as "fully and permanently established," and there is no doubt that a few years will make a complete change in our inland system of travelling. As this change, by the partial removal of horse labour, will be accompanied by the highest *economic* results to society, it is a matter, we consider, of the last importance, that its mode of introduction should become a *national measure*. We have too long pursued the false system of allowing great inventions to be appropriated by the capitalist, instead of appropriating them for the common good. The introduction of this new species of locomotion, which is the most important discovery ever made by man, for it will double the wealth, population, and prosperity of the nation, may be made to undo this evil eventually to the extent of from twelve to fifteen millions yearly. For including poor-rates, which the writer proposes should be applied to the introduction of locomotive carriages, and the sum exported annually for flax, hemp, corn, &c., which the removal of horses will enable us to grind at home, there is a sum yearly of above 40,000,000*l.* engaged in the Post-office, Roads, and Stage-coaches, one-third of which, or more, may be economized for the public service.

We believe that all our readers, whatever may be the shade of their political opinions, will agree with us in thinking, that whatever would tend to effect a reduction of taxation, to cheapen food, distribute capital, and give more general and active employment to the labouring classes, should be entertained as a paramount matter for mature consideration. In this supposition we have no hesitation in calling their attention to the *proposal* made in this pamphlet. After taking a view of the plan we cannot doubt that its adoption must guarantee the most important change in the social condition of the country; a change which would not only remedy the evils which we are groaning under at home, but develop our power to an extent that will place our ascendancy among nations far above the altitude of competition. In proportion, however, to our conviction upon this point is our doubt whether



Ministers will have the spirit, prudence, and judgment requisite, for the adoption of a proposition so novel and important. The change is too complete and sweeping, and we may add the advantages of it are far too probable and definite, to allow us to suppose that the plan will meet the approbation of our reform-professors who hold the reins of Government, unless the *national voice be raised in its favour*. We are happy to observe that the daily press is taking up the subject, and recommending that it should be strenuously advocated in Parliament, and urgently enforced upon the Government to entertain the idea, and institute the inquiry suggested, preparatory to some legislative enactment. We hope our readers will look into the matter—the *proposal* is one that affects the interests of every family in the three kingdoms. As the appointment of the Committee prayed for in the pamphlet will greatly depend upon the subject being taken up by the public, previous to Mr. Wallace's motion of the Post-office, on the 6th of next month, we hope they will not omit the opportunity.

#### COMBINATION FOR RAISING WAGES.

The labouring classes form the great majority of every community, and, as has been already observed, a country must be considered as happy or miserable, in proportion as those classes are abundantly or scantily supplied with the necessaries and comforts of life. From this principle it necessarily follows, that combinations for lowering wages, could they be effectual, must be regarded as conspiracies for increasing human misery; and that combinations for raising wages, could they be effectual, must be approved as associations for the promotion of human happiness. In the whole compass of economical science, the most important practical question is this, namely, *can combinations, amongst the labouring classes, exact a permanent increase of wages?*—Colonel Torrens.

#### CHARITABLE BANKS FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE OPERATIVE AND LABOURING CLASSES.

AMONGST the many admirable institutions devised by Napoleon Bonaparte, for the benefit of France, and worthy of imitation by the other countries of Europe, few are more excellent in their principle, more simple in their detail, more perfect in their system, or more practicable in attainment, than the regulation which he instituted for establishing of "*Le Mont de Piété*," or charitable banks; and we know of no plan more easily put into execution, or more peculiarly suited to the wants of Ireland, than similar institutions. One of those now rare characters, a pains-taking, enterprising, and resident Irish landlord, of ample means, has bestowed considerable time and attention in trying to establish such banks amongst us, which he has justly designated as being "*far more EFFICACIOUS THAN A COMPULSORY POOR-RATE.*"

Of the beneficial practical results from such institutions in Ireland, we have little doubt, and of their highly salutary effect upon the habits and morals of the people, there can be no question; they would draw into active operation and usefulness both land and exertions, that now lie barren and slothful, and without requiring considerable advances, and attended with *no loss* to the subscriber or community, put into operation valuable energies and enterprises upon such rational and certain return as would ensure the stability of these institutions. In a future number we shall return to this important subject, and give some details of the plan, merely observing, that as the SAVINGS-BANKS fund has now accumulated to upwards of TWENTY MILLIONS sterling, there is no shadow of doubt upon our minds but that the Charitable Banks would, in a very few years, vastly exceed that amount, having, meantime, effected a great and permanent good to the community, and in all human probability obviated the necessity of applying POOR LAWS to Ireland.—*Stewart's Dispatch—Dublin Newspaper.*

## GREAT MEETING, IN THE CITY OF LONDON, FOR THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

ONE of the largest Meetings ever held in the City of London, took place on Monday evening last, in the great room of the London Tavern, for the purpose of proposing and discussing certain resolutions as to the evils produced by the union between the Church and the State, and the desirability of dissolving their connexion. The newspapers have, generally, given a very brief account of its proceedings, *The Times* despatches the whole business, which occupied five hours, in a very short abstract of the speeches. *The Morning Herald*, *Morning News*, and *Morning Advertiser*, each contain a short report, of about a column only, from the same reporter. *The Morning Chronicle* alone, of all the daily papers, contains a tolerably full report; and this, from the carelessness of the printers, is printed in such a way as to make much of it unintelligible, parts of the speech of one gentleman being incorporated with parts of the speech of another, in such a way as to make them all imperfect and incomplete.

As this is the first great Meeting in the metropolis, at which the Separation of the Church from the State has been publicly advocated, and as we feel assured that this question will soon become the all-engrossing topic of public discussion and public action, we think we shall render an acceptable service to our readers, in placing before them, for perusal and record, a more accurate account of these proceedings, than has appeared in any of the papers, or than is to be found in any other quarter; the more especially, as Lord Brougham, Lord Grey, Lord Althorp, and Lord John Russell, have each expressed their determination to uphold the Church Establishment at all hazards, and at all cost.

The Meeting was convened for six o'clock; but such was the desire to secure admission, that the room was entirely filled soon after five. Every seat was removed from the body of the hall to admit only of standing room; and every part of the floor was densely filled, while the galleries were crowded with ladies. The reporters state that from 2000 to 3000 persons were present; and add, that as many were unable to obtain admission. The audience presented the most respectable appearance; and every thing marked the greatest earnestness of purpose in all present. At six o'clock, Mr. Hume, M.P., took the chair; and the business of the evening then proceeded as follows:

The CHAIRMAN said that he attended there at the request of a numerous and respectable body of his constituents; and the interest which so many friends of Civil and Religious Liberty took in the settlement of this great and important question was, he hoped, a sufficient warranty for his absence from those Legislative duties which might ordinarily be considered to have a more legitimate demand upon his time. (Hear.) On an occasion like the present, when interests

so deep and so important were at stake—interests which involved, in a greater degree than many might at first sight imagine, the future peace, happiness and welfare of this great country—he felt that in justice to himself and to his constituents he could not be absent. (Cheers.) With the general subject of their meeting they were so well acquainted, that he would only occupy their attention by a few observations on some of the few topics that it involved. The great question before them was, how far the system now existing in this country, by which one portion of its inhabitants should have peculiar privileges and emoluments for the support of and for the performance of their religious duties, was consonant with the well-being of the mass of the community, and how long that system, if inconsistent with such well-being, ought to be permitted to exist (hear)? It might, perhaps, be matter of doubt with many who now sought the disalliance of the Church from the State, whether that alliance was not, at the time of the Reformation, absolutely necessary for the protection of the Protestant religion from the hostile power and influence of the Pope and the Popish Church, and whether the Protestants would not in vain have struggled for existence but for the protection of the State. (Hear! and cries of “never, never.”) Well, every man would doubtless exercise his own judgment. It was but a speculative point, and that was his reading of our history. The question which now fairly came before the consideration of the people was, not whether this alliance was in its origin good or bad, necessary or unnecessary; but whether the existing state of our institutions, and of the times, rendered it desirable or not that this alliance should any longer continue. (Hear.) There could not be a doubt in his mind that the Dissenters had for a series of years suffered various grievances which they ought not to have laboured under, and for the remedying of which they had long petitioned in vain. (Hear.) He, however, had been one of those who flattered themselves within the last six or seven years that the time was at length approaching when those grievances would be redressed. After the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts—after the repeal of the Catholic disabilities—after the various improvements which had taken place in our civil and fiscal regulations, he confessed that he was perhaps foolish enough to think the time was come when all the remaining disabilities imposed upon the Dissenters would be swept away, and themselves put upon an equal footing with believers of every creed. (Hear, hear.) But when he and others found that they had been disappointed in these expectations—when they found that the measures passed by, or proposed to, the Legislature were utterly inadequate as cures for the evils which they proposed to remedy—when they found that no attention was paid to their just, moderate, and reasonable requests, it then became a question for them to consider whether it would not be even more expedient for them to adopt the manly course of coming forward at once and demanding the whole of their civil rights. (Loud cheers.) They were not merely called on to consider the propriety of Dissenters petitioning the Legislature for a fair and general registry of births, marriages, and burials; they were not called to consider merely whether they should any longer pay Church-rates to support a Church in whose doctrines they did not believe, or to claim the admission of Dissenters to the universities; but to consider whether there was not some great and decisive principle, the practical recognition of which by the Legislature, would at once remove all their complaints—to consider, in short, whether they should not lay the axe to the root of the tree, whose noxious branches they had vainly endeavoured to lop. (Hear, hear.)

He was one who had been anxious to bring about these great changes gradually and progressively—he had been one of those who thought it imprudent to demand so much at first; but now he was anxious wholly to remove from Dissenters all complaints arising from the compulsion on them to support a Church to which they did not belong, more especially knowing that that Church had ample funds on which to support itself in the most liberal manner. (Hear, hear.) But he would candidly tell them, that it was not until lately that he was convinced of the expediency of this course. It was not until he was convinced of the determination of the Church Establishment to do nothing—it was not until he saw that to every reasonable request a direct negative was given—it was not until he saw that the peace of the country would probably be disturbed for years

by the separate discussion of all these various grievances—it was not until he became fully convinced of these things, that his mind embraced the conviction that it was most politic to demand at once the only efficient remedy—viz., the dissolution of the alliance between Church and State. (Great cheering.) One great benefit, at least, would be the destruction of that political influence which the State had hitherto exercised over the Church for the most corrupt purposes. There had scarcely been one single measure of tyranny, taxation, or oppression under which this country had suffered, in the prosecution of which the Government of the day had not had the full benefit of the support of the Church Establishment—(hear, hear); and now they attempted to revive the cry of the Church in danger. (Laughter.) That cry would no longer do. (No, no.) No doubt there was danger; but the danger was not to their religion, but to their monopoly—to that monopoly which they enjoyed at the expense of the many millions who dissented from their doctrines. (Hear, hear.) This was a manifest injustice. (Hear, hear.) The whole question was merely one of policy; for, as to principle, there was not a man who could think for five minutes who would not agree with it, and who, moreover, would not say, that the Bishops should be removed from the House of Peers. (Hear.) Indeed the best interests of the Establishment itself, regarded as a religion, would be consulted by it, for all history and all experience told them that political power injured instead of benefiting a religious institution. Had the Bishops shown a desire to remove those just complaints which the Dissenters had for years past made? Had the manner in which they had exercised their suffrages tended to make them more agreeable to the people of this country than they intrinsically were? (Hear.) And even now, did they not set themselves in an attitude of resolute defiance to the claim of the Dissenters for admission to and participation in the great national establishments of the realm? No doubt in these wise attempts at resisting all concession, however trivial, they would have the concurrence and assistance of the House of Peers; but it would remain for the country to say how far the House of Commons, representing not only particular interests, but the interests of the whole community, should permit this system long to exist.

From the course then adopted by the clergy, and from the course which he was sorry to say his Majesty's Government seemed inclined to adopt, he was no longer able to pursue that medium line of policy which he had formerly advocated. He stated it as his opinion, given after mature deliberation, that the Government of the day was determined to yield nothing to justice only—that they were determined to hold out to the last for the possession of all the exclusive privileges of the Church Establishment. (Hear, hear.) They had, indeed, attempted some pitiful specimens of redressive legislation, but such attempts would not do in the present times. (Cheers.) Some radical and effective alteration was imperiously required. The Government was not alive to the state of the country. (Hear.) The Ministers did not sufficiently feel the importance of those who now complained of the proscription of existing laws. (Hear, hear.) They acted ruinously in relation to the State; they acted ruinously in relation even to the Established Church. (Hear.) As a public man, therefore, he pledged himself (and he never shrunk from acting up to his pledge) to devote his best exertions to the promotion of the cause which he had espoused. (Cheers.) If the Ministers of the country, on the representations of the people, abandoned their duty, and were about to toss abroad the apple of discord, it was right that the people should step forward and tell them of their error. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had declared, soon after he took office, that it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to carry on the administration of affairs in accordance with the wishes and the feelings of the majority of the people. If, therefore, he was to give the Government credit for sincerity, he could only account for their apathy on this subject by their ignorance of the real state of public opinion in England. This, therefore, made it more than ever imperative on the people to let their sentiments be known, and to give to their expression the weighty sanction of calm deliberation. (Hear, hear.) Considerable difference of opinion existed as to what measure would effectually accomplish the separation of the Church from the State. Some seemed to think that complete freedom from all

the burdens pressing on Dissenters and an equality of civil rights were all that was required; whilst others thought that the property of the Church ought to be applied for public and national purposes. (Cheers.) He would therefore recommend to those whose duty it would be to introduce the Resolutions, to state clearly and explicitly what they required, that no after-charge of concealment, or want of candour, should ever with a shadow of fairness be brought against them. The honourable gentleman concluded amidst general applause, by soliciting the orderly attention of the Meeting to every person who should address them, whether inimical or favourable to the object they had in view.

The Rev. W. J. Fox said that in moving the first resolution which was to be submitted to the Meeting, he felt it incumbent on him to say a few words as to the motives which influenced those who sent forth the requisition calling the present assembly. That requisition did not originate exclusively with the devotees of any particular creed, or with the members of any particular party. It originated with men of many denominations, opinions, and parties, having one feeling in common on a question on which civil and religious liberty in their opinion depended. (Hear.) They sought to promote no hostile proceeding towards any party, religious or political; they had no hostility to the Church of England, as a Church. (Hear.) They sought not to deprive it of any property which really belonged to it—they came not there to discuss the propriety of its arrangements, or of its creeds or forms—they wished it all success as a moral institution—they wanted only one thing—to keep its rod off their backs. (Hear, hear.) They had no feeling, no principle, which an intelligent and religious and benevolent Christian might not most heartily join in; for what man of that description could desire either to plunder his neighbour or to degrade his neighbour? (Hear, hear.) They came not there to advocate any particular party; nor did they come there in opposition to the Church. It was stated the other day, by a curious specimen of Oxford, logical commonplace, that all who differed from the Church wanted but to establish their own religion in its place; and the proof which they alleged was, that all their petitions tended to the separation of Church from State; which was in effect supposing (to put a parallel case) that any man who said it was better to live without animal food, must necessarily have a desire to steal his neighbour's leg of mutton. (Cheers, and laughter.) They came not there merely on account of the present state of the dissenting claims, although there had been lately a variety of negotiations between the Dissenters in London and the Ministry, and the position into which both had put themselves by those negotiations, had excited feelings which he thought it would be well for the Dissenters of London to express—but that was not a dissenting meeting, but a meeting of the friends of civil and religious liberty of all denominations. Their object was one which ought equally to influence Churchman and Dissenter—believer and unbeliever—Protestant and Catholic—Jew and Christian: for their object was to put every man in the possession of equal civil rights, whatever might be his peculiar religious opinions. (Cheers.) The resolutions which had been drawn up, demanded for every man this important right—this right so essential to the well-being of all the political, religious, and social relations of the community. In those resolutions they declared what their chairman had required—they declared that they did not recognise the right of Governments to frame a religion for the nations whose affairs they superintended. (Hear, hear.) They declared that their so doing was an invasion of the rights of conscience, and an establishment of a system of castes to which free men ought not to submit. (Hear, hear.) They went on to declare, that the revenues of the Church, as at present administered, formed a great corruption-fund, the existence of which was perilous to the interests of the nation—that the interests of knowledge and religion, and morality, and of the Church of England herself, so far as she pursued those objects, were endangered by a civil establishment, and that all those public purposes would be much better provided for by leaving every religious system to bear its own burdens. (Loud cheers.) The resolutions, therefore, went on to declare, that whilst they regarded the different grievances put forth by different denominations, as grievances that ought to be redressed, they regarded as the great national grievance of all, the establishment of a political hierarchy. (Hear, hear, hear.) They prayed, therefore, that such hierarchy might be dis-

solved by the abolition of the Spiritual Peerages, by devoting to national purposes the national property now held by clerical corporations (great cheering); and, by putting all religionists on the same footing, thus establishing the only state of things really deserving the name of civil and religious liberty. (Hear, hear.) That was the disunion which they wished to effect—a disunion which was fairly to be compared, not to the tearing a branch from the constitution, but rather to the tearing a fungus from the tree in which it had rooted itself. (Hear, hear.) Then, indeed, would the civil constitution of our country resemble one of our native oaks—its roots deep in the earth, its branches tossing high in the air—from whose trunk they had severed the unnatural alliance of the fungus, which would fain have drunk up its sap, and rooted itself in the noble tree, till the contagion of its rottenness spread through every limb, and made it fall a victim to the first storm that burst upon its devoted head. (Immense cheering.)

They might be told, perhaps, that the object which they had in view was impracticable. This he denied. He was aware they would have to encounter difficulties and opposition; but what great and important change had been effected without them? (Hear.) And he would repeat, on the part of the requisitionists, that they were men who looked to principles, believing that by adherence to principles alone, the world could be eventually governed so as to realize the highest interests of the human race. In their opinion this was not a matter of the day; it was a conviction deep-rooted in their minds—and the whole experience of their lives, all they had read and all they had heard, confirmed the conviction that political freedom cannot flourish—that religious freedom cannot flourish in purity and power—that a nation cannot flourish when it labours under the blighting and withering influence of a clerical monopoly. (Hear.) They came forward to declare those sentiments boldly—they promulgated them as matters of eternal moment, which were of the day only so far as the disappointments of the day turned the feelings of some towards them, and as the increasing intelligence of the day directed the minds of others towards them; thus giving motives for their assertion to those who, without such stimulants, might have disregarded them altogether. (Hear.) They denied the right of a Government to frame a religion for a community. Whether a Government existed by delegation or by conquest, the assumption of such a right was one of the most extraordinary, one of the most monstrous, ever made by frail and presumptuous man. (Hear.) If it were the right of one government, it was the right of all governments—if it were the right of one ruler, it was the right of the most despotic sovereign on the face of the earth. If conquest gave the right, then had the autocrat of Russia a right to march into the squares of Warsaw, at the head of his mechanical battalions and Cossack Guards, and there say, "I have violated my promise; I have destroyed your nationality; I have confiscated your property; I have sent your nobles to Siberia; I have torn your children from their mothers; I have established a right of conquest, and now I shall exercise my right—in making a religion." (Hear.) Make a religion! Why, if to Government belonged the power of originating a religion, to Government must belong the power of changing it; and thus would they open the way to the monstrous scene of members of a delegated Government proposing as a resolution that the soul should be declared immortal, and that Providence should reign supreme on earth. Something, too, like this had already occurred, as the history of past times would prove. Make a religion! It was not enough for our rulers to do merely that. Where were the men of largest minds and purest hearts, who could be trusted with such a task, and who would not rather feel it their duty to bow down to earth to receive that divine inspiration which Heaven alone could give? (Hear.) Man make a religion! As well might man pretend to make a world—to spread abroad a new heaven—to launch suns, stars, and planets, revolving through new orbits into the regions of boundless space—to spread abroad the vital principle of air which we breathe—as well might he pretend to do this, as to embody in forms and prescriptions the ethereal essence, which, springing from Heaven alone, holds undivided and imperial sway over his soul and spirit. (Hear, hear.) The man who would thus presume, would be like the mad philosopher in Dr. Johnson's story, who thought he could command the thunderbolt where to strike and the sun-beam where to glow. (Hear, and cheers.) They could recognise no interference between Government and

conscience; and the same freedom which they claimed for themselves they claimed for all their brethren of the human race. All that Government had to do with religions was, to keep the peace between the parties, should the animosities of theological controversy excite them beyond the bounds of moderation. But what sort of peace could an establishment keep? If it did not prevail entirely over the population of a country (as it never could prevail over the population of an enlightened country) its emoluments would be a prize constantly upheld to contention—a continual excitement to theological warfare. (Hear.) If it should entirely prevail, what peace would it be then? What, but such a peace as prevails in Spain and Portugal, and other countries under the complete dominion of priestcraft? (Hear.) In that sense, the peace of the church would be the peace of the churchyard—where there is peace, because there is no intellectual—no moral vitality (hear); where there is peace, because every eye is dim, and every arm nerveless—and where force wars not with force, nor man with man; because all are fast mingling into one mass of corruption, and the only sense of vitality left is that of the crawling reptile who feeds and fattens there. (Great cheers.)

So much for the abstract principle of our Establishment. It was scarcely necessary to say that this description was not intended to apply to the Church of England, for it was agreed on all hands that the Church of England was the best of all Established Churches. But whether or not they were to consider the principle in relation to her institutions, suppose a foreigner, totally unacquainted with the circumstances of the case, were told that the revenues of the Church Establishment were 9,000,000*l.* per annum at one calculation, and at the lowest not under 3,000,000*l.* how would he suppose this money was applied? Would he not imagine that in the first place an enlightened and moral teacher was provided for every district of the country, and that according to the labour of each, the money would be proportionally applied? Would not this be a natural—a reasonable supposition; and yet need he say he would make, at the least, a most egregious blunder? What would he say when he heard that out of 11,000 parishes more than two-thirds, in the proportion at least of six to four, were committed to the care of non-residents? (Hear, hear.) That of those 11,000 parishes more than 4000 or 5000 were supplied with curates, and that the livings in which the rectors were resident were chiefly those of a smaller amount, and that the real work of the Church was probably done for considerably under 1,000,000*l.*, and that all the rest was sinecurism, and applied to other purposes than religious instruction? (Hear, hear.) What would be his opinion of our wisdom, when he found that the remainder—the greater portion of this fund—was divided amongst 26 Bishops, 700 Ecclesiastical Dignitaries, and 4000 beneficed Clergymen, chiefly connected with the aristocracy of the country, and owning that sort of connexion with their flocks, which partook more of the shears than the shepherd's crook? (Hear, hear.) He would not go into the religious part of the question, because that fell more properly to the lot of those whose duty it would be to propose the succeeding Resolutions. He confined himself to the political bearing of the case. He came before them as an Englishman, who could not bear that his civil rights should be invaded by parties of this description. Did it tend to the political freedom of the country that several millions per annum should be at the disposal of the Administration of the day to serve all the purposes of political corruption? (Hear, hear.) Let them look to all the recipients of this fund—to those who expected to be recipients—and it would not be forgotten that a fund so unequally divided, presented many gradations from a lower to a higher rate of payment—let them remember how many connected with those recipients had seats in the legislature, and how many had votes for its members, and then they might, perhaps, form something like an adequate notion of the extensive influence possessed by an enormously wealthy and close corporation, when supporting a sinister interest. (Hear.) What had been the results of such an establishment? History and experience have proved them to be just what might have been expected. In South's Sermons it was boasted that the Church of England alone, of all churches, broached the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance. (Hear, hear.) And these doctrines were only forgotten when more liberal opi-

nions forced their way into legislation. Need he refer to the persecutions instituted by the Church under the House of Tudor? Need he say who supported to the utmost the unjust system of taxing America, which lost England the brightest jewel in the Imperial Crown? Need he advert to the period of the French Revolution? Who fanned the warlike fury of this country into a blaze (cries of "the Bishops")? Yes, and bade to the banquet of fire, blood, and slaughter, in even the name of the Prince of Peace. (Hear.) When the abolition of the slave trade was proposed, did not a late Chancellor declare that the traffic in human bodies could not be inconsistent with religion, because the Bishops had not denounced it? (Hear.) Who had imposed the censorship on the press, and who were now its greatest enemies—but the clergy? (Hear.) Had they not been the most inveterate enemies of education; and though there were ample educational funds in England, were they not perverted from the object, and the greater part kept as sinecures in the hands of the Established Church? Who now oppose the grant of a charter to the London University—that grant which Henry Brougham said, in 1825, no Administration could be so corrupt as to dare to refuse? Either the present Administration must be monstrously corrupted, or greatly overawed by that power which they formerly set at naught. But the last act which he should mention—an act which could never be forgotten—an act which was unparalleled in history—was the daring interference of the Bishops in the case of the Reform Bill, between the people and the recognition of those just rights which they demanded with united and imperative voice. (Hear, hear, hear.) In conclusion, he called on every man who loved civil and religious liberty; he called on every man who had aught in him of reverence for religion or love for freedom, who wished to see the population educated, and those who toiled remunerated, and who desired that the means of corruption should be abolished, and the interest, glory, and prosperity of the country firmly established—he called on every such man to support these Resolutions. (Immense applause.) The Rev. Gentleman concluded by moving the first Resolution:

"That the alliance of Church and State is an extension of the authority of the civil power beyond its legitimate province, and an interference with the rights of conscience; that it tends to divide society into privileged and subordinate castes, on account of differences in religious opinion; that it taxes the industry of the community to supply a fund which is often applied to the purposes of political corruption; and that it establishes an influence which continually opposes itself to salutary measures of reform and national improvement."

Mr. BUCKINGHAM, M.P. said, that after the very able and elaborate exposition of the evils of an Established Church, which had just been addressed to the Meeting, it might seem difficult to add to the strength of the arguments, or to increase much the store of valuable authorities, which had fallen from the gentleman who had preceded him. As, however, the question was about to become one which he was sure would agitate the country until it was tranquilly decided (hear), he held it to be the duty of every man who was called upon to take a share in such proceedings, to leave no doubt as to his individual opinions, but to state distinctly, clearly, and unambiguously, the view which he took on so important a matter. Their hon. chairman had stated that it was but recently he had come to the conclusion that it was necessary to consider of the propriety of separating the Church from the State, he being one of those who would have been content, if Government had yielded to the wishes of the Dissenting community, in relieving them from the more pressing grievances under which they suffered. Now he (Mr. B.) was not in the condition of the chairman in this respect, although he believed that his hon. friend (Mr. Hume) did, in this tardy and reluctant consideration of the question of such separation, represent a very large class of Englishmen in that particular. (Hear.) He (Mr. Buckingham) could say for himself, however, truly—and he made no scruple of avowing it publicly—that so long as he remembered to have thought at all upon this subject of the connexion between the Church and the State, so long had he deemed it injurious to both. He had thought that if ever an opportunity was presented him of expressing his opinion upon it, he could show, clearly to others the reasons, which had satisfied himself why a dominant re-



ligious Establishment was disadvantageous to good government in the State, and why it was equally prejudicial to the best interests of Christianity in the Church. He had not the remotest desire to injure the latter in her spiritual capacity; it was only of her temporal power that he complained; and if she were shorn of all this to-morrow, her doctrines and her worship might remain untouched. He believed indeed that whatsoever there was of good in the Church of England, was good because of its connexion with the true and permanent interests of sound religion: that whatsoever there was of bad in it, was bad because of its connexion with the false and fleeting interests of party politics; and that if it could be purged of the one, while it retained the other, it would be a great advantage to all parties. But he would examine this question under the two great heads which he had described.

First, then, as regarded the utility to the State of a Church Establishment. The object which was avowed by all Governments—even by those which had not always been most zealous in following out their professions by practice—was the happiness of the great majority of the country. He asked them whether there was any one ingredient in human happiness more valuable, one for which men had contended more manfully, one which they would make larger sacrifices to maintain, than that element—the perfectly undisturbed enjoyment of their religious opinions? (Hear, hear, hear.) If they believed, then, that there was in the human mind such a variety of organization, as that men could not, from force and compulsion, entertain any particular opinions at the bidding of any earthly authority, calling itself orthodox, because it had the power to enforce its doctrines, and making all others heretics who dissented from their views;—if they conceived that in reading the Scriptures different conclusions would be come to by different persons;—if they recognised, in short, the right of private judgment in matters of faith, then they at once impugned the propriety of State Establishments, since no Establishment could deserve the name of a State Religion, which did not prescribe uniformity of opinion, a prescription which was wholly inconsistent with religious freedom or political independence. (Applause.) He said, then, that for the Church to be allied to the State was prejudicial to political liberty and to human happiness; and that the State was not aided, but absolutely impeded in its views for the general good, even supposing the Church was conducted in the best possible mode. But after the recapitulation which had been made to the Meeting, of the manner in which the influence of the Church had been used, in connexion with the powers of the State, they might be satisfied that the Church had not been so conducted. History told them, in one uniform and unbroken strain, from its earliest annals to the present time, that wherever corruption and despotism had to be supported, the great Dignitaries of the Established Church had been constantly the first to give their aid—that wherever civil liberty had to be extended, or education to be promoted, and the happiness of the majority, that is, the labouring classes, to be advanced—not only was the Church the last to come forward, but she was the first to put herself in the front rank against those who had now been brought to regard her as their bitter and irreconcilable enemy (applause);—and it was not until the Dissenters had themselves set the example, in the metropolis and in the provinces, of promoting education, circulating publications, and awakening the dormant energies of the poorer classes into political and religious life, that the Church, fearing its own privileges would be endangered, began to set up rival universities, counter publications, and orthodox schools; yet even now, at the eleventh hour, the scarcely-concealed hostility of the Church to every advance towards political improvement was unhappily but too apparent; and its connexion with the State giving it far more power than it would otherwise possess, its alliance was in the last degree injurious to good government, and hostile to the best interests of the very State from which it derived its strength. (Loud cheers.)

He came, next, to the question—Did the union of the State with the Church lead to the promotion of sound religion? for on this single question rested the whole gist of the Resolution. He confessed, for himself, that he considered this union as even more injurious to the Church, regarding it as an instrument of religion, than it was to the State itself. And why? If he were asked for a model for a

Church, he would naturally refer to the volume of his faith, the New Testament, of which, the history of the Gospel, and the early promulgation of Christianity, formed the subject matter. It had been his lot to have read that volume in the land where its scenes were laid, and its events had transpired; and amidst the simple beauty of its narratives and its associations, he had often thought that if it were possible to carry some one from the interior of central Africa who had never heard any thing of Europe, and by some sudden charm to imbue him with sufficient education to read the Gospel history in Palestine, and if they were then to refer him to the description of our Church Establishment in England—even if it were given by a churchman himself—for the purpose of inquiring whether there were any resemblance between those two things—(applause)—he was quite sure that such an individual would suppose the question to be asked in mockery. He would say, “I cannot truly understand the language in which you make the inquiry; you cannot mean to ask me whether the meek and lowly religion of the Church of Christ, as depicted in the Gospel, and the religion of the Church of England, as seen in the Articles and Homilies, and deans and chapters, and bishops and cathedrals—and robes and mitres—and principalities, and powers, and pomps and vanities of modern times—resemble each other: but your meaning must be—Did you ever see two things so different?” (Applause.) This would be the simple and unsophisticated conclusion of a man brought to read the Gospel for the first time, and then to contemplate, also for the first time, a Church Establishment, as it is seen in England. The truth was, that education, and early impressions, and the long habits of veneration in which we had all been brought up in regard to the Establishment, had blinded us to many of its defects, and we were therefore unable to judge of them as they would be seen by a stranger. But if any of the disciples of the Saviour, or the early Apostles, who first spread the Gospel through heathen lands, could reappear among us now, their astonishment would be extreme to see the scarcely credible metamorphosis which the simple beauty of primitive Christianity had undergone. (Cheers.)

It had been thought desirable that persons praying for the separation of Church and State, should explain distinctly what they meant; and he remembered that on a discussion which had taken place elsewhere, upon a petition presented to that effect, a gentleman had alleged that they who prayed for this separation did not understand what they wished. In order that he might not be subject to this imputation, he would say at once, that he meant by this separation, to take from the Church all her temporal wealth and temporal power, derived alone from her connexion with the State, and place her on an exact level with all the other religious sects of the country, neither above nor below any, but equal with them all. The Church at the present time depended on three distinct kinds of property. The first consisted of tithe; the second consisted of endowments, benefactions, and legacies left by pious individuals; and the third consisted of rates taken from the population generally, for the repair of the churches and other uses. Of these three classes of property the tithe was of Jewish origin; and if he had read the Bible rightly, it was given to the Levites, in payment for their services, and in lieu of all other participation in the wealth possessed by the other tribes; for, while all the rest of the children of Israel had lands allotted to each tribe, the Levites had none—and, accordingly, the tithe of all the produce was given to them, on this express ground, “because they had no other inheritance.” If, in the present day, after the Levitical mode, tithes were now only enjoyed by those who had no other allowance to subsist upon—if they merely, as heretofore, provided food, raiment, and shelter for the priesthood, he believed that no complaint would be made against them. But being of Jewish origin, they ought to have no place in Christian estimation; they ought to be as utterly abolished as the sacrifices themselves—(hear, hear); and the clergy of the Church of England might as well come forward and demand an oblation of bulls, rams, and goats—(cheers)—or the various offerings of the Jewish ages, as demand those tithes which were for a Jewish ceremonial, and which had been wrongfully adopted by the Christian Church. Since, then, they did not belong to the church, or to the landlord, and as they should not be given up to the tenant; he contended for the right, and whenever he had an opportunity, he would

maintain the right of the State, to appropriate every farthing of those tithes. (Loud cheers.) There were many modes in which their whole amount might be advantageously devoted to the great public purposes of, educating the ignorant, relieving the sick, sustaining the poor, and other works of benevolence and utility: and to these, and these only, ought they to be applied. (Hear, hear, hear.)

Supposing the Church, then, to be divested of all the wealth, consisting of purely ecclesiastical tithes (for lay impropriations rested of course on a very different basis), there would still remain the second description of her property, consisting of those endowments, legacies, and benefactions, which from time to time had been bestowed on her by pious individuals, whose death bed interviews with ghostly confessors were often followed by large donations to the Church, as an easy mode of obtaining absolution from sins, which they were taught to believe the priests of the day could give, if they were handsomely paid for the favour. Now as the greater part of these endowments had been made by our Roman Catholic ancestors to promote the interests of the Romish Church, to pay for masses said for the souls of the dead, &c.; it must be clear, that if the will of the benefactor was to be the rule for guiding their appropriation, these endowments ought to have been given to Catholic establishments, when the Protestant Church dissented, and reformed, and separated itself from the Papal jurisdiction and Papal power. And if it should be said, that the State had a right to turn these legacies to a better account, and transfer them to the support of what the benefactor would call a pernicious heresy had he been alive—so had the State now an equal right to say, that since they could not be appropriated in strict accordance with the original donor's will without injury to the public weal, nor continued in their present shape without disadvantage to the interests of the community at large, they had an equal right now to transfer them to such beneficial purpose as the Legislature might see fit. It was worthy of remark, however, that when these endowments and the tithes were claimed as the exclusive property of the Church, it seemed to be forgotten that this word, in its right acceptation did, not mean the Bishops and the Clergy of the Church of England, but the whole congregation of the Christian Church, wherever situated. The word used in the original Greek was "ECCLESIA," from whence we have our term Ecclesiastical; but this Ecclesia meant simply assembly or congregation. In this sense it was used by the Greek poet, Aristophanes:—"the assembly of the wicked," in which David prayed not to be found, is called "ECCLESIA" in the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Psalms; and in the Acts of the Apostles the same term was used to denote a riotous and confused multitude. But those who had the direction of the work of translating the New Testament out of the original Greek, were positively instructed, as we learn from Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation, to translate the word "ECCLESIA" as Church, and not as Congregation, which was its only true and legitimate meaning. (Hear, hear.) As to the motives with which such instructions were given, he would say nothing; they must be apparent to all; but this he would add, that if the word Congregation were substituted for Church, in all the places in which the latter term appeared, the "patronage of the Congregation" and "the wealth of the Congregation" would convey very different impressions from those now attached to the phrase, "the privileges and property of the Church." (Loud cheers.)

He came lastly to the third description of Church property—the rates levied from all classes of householders, churchmen, and dissenters, for the repair of the churches and other purposes purely connected with the State Establishments; in reference to which they had seen lately a measure of Government, which he was glad to find had excited universal dissatisfaction. He was glad, because it proved to him that there was a clear and strong sense of honesty and justice in the community, whatever were the blindness and muddiness of vision of those who ruled. (Hear.) He found that the people perceived this to be a mere juggle, and were aware that the transfer of it would make it worse than before, since it would render permanent that which was before unstable; besides which, it laid the burden on the shoulders of those who never before had contributed, namely, the Catholic Irish, and the Presbyterian Scotch. To the Church—of which he confessed himself one—it was degrading to say, that it could not stand without

these helps. (Applause.) What would the high-minded bankers and merchants of the City say, if contributions had to be gathered at every corner of the streets to support and maintain them? (Hear.) They would repudiate such a notion with disdain, and would declare at once, that they were wealthy enough to support themselves. If the Church were indeed poor, if it had been stripped of any of its undoubted wealth by persecution or plunder, if it stood in need of the aid of its friends to accomplish some object to which its own resources was inadequate, it might then reasonably ask for support from others; but even then that support should be voluntary. It was degrading to any religious establishment to exact rates from persons even of its own persuasion, under the coercion of pains and penalties if refused; but still more disgraceful to wring it from those who were of a different persuasion, and then by the power of the aid thus obtained to turn against their contributors, and deny them an equal enjoyment of civil and religious freedom, which the Church was now doing. (Great applause.)

But if the Church were divested of her tithes—if her endowments were equitably applied to some charitable purposes, and if church-rates were abolished altogether—would the Church, even then, be divested of every thing? Was it not notorious that the members of the Church of England, from the peerage to the gentry, included, if not the most numerous, at least the most wealthy section of society? (No, no.) Here then was the monstrous absurdity of the wealthiest portion of the community calling upon the least wealthy to assist them in a matter so dear to every man as religion ought to be. The fact, however, was, that whilst religion was to the poorer man a matter of the heart, it was a mere affair of pomp and pretension to the richer. The poor were, therefore, willing to put their hands into their own pockets, and contribute their mite, however small, to the voluntary support of Dissenting chapels and Dissenting teachers. But religion sat very lightly indeed on the shoulders of the rich. They would wear it so long as other people would pay for it, but they did not love it so ~~well~~ as to be anxious to pay for it themselves. (Hear.) He hoped, however, that this would be fairly put to the test: that every sect would be called upon to support its own teachers, and its own edifices, and we should then see who were sincere and who were not; and which sect was most earnest in its desire to spread religion for its own sake, without regard to emolument, honour, or reward. (Much cheering.)

For himself, he was no advocate for a State religion in any way; but if the will of the majority demanded the formation of some system of national worship, and its teachers were to be paid at the national expense, and he were called upon to suggest the mode of their payment, he should recommend the adoption of the very opposite principle to that now observed. At present, the working curate receives the least pay, and as he grows older and higher in the clerical profession, his emoluments are augmented, as if in the supposition that he became more and more worldly the longer he administered what were called sacred things, till he rolled in wealth as he approached a bishopric, and lived in a palace and ruled a principality when he came to be the primate of the land. (Hear, hear.) Now he (Mr. Buckingham) thought that the very reverse of this rule would be a nearer approach to the religion of Jesus, which was self-denying, wealth-abjuring, and meek, lowly, and submissive, in the most striking degree; the Saviour himself setting the example of a willing and a cheerful poverty, commanding his disciples to sell all that they had and give to the poor, advising them to take neither purse nor scrip for their journey, and teaching that the love of money was the root of all evil, and that the rich man could not enter the kingdom of heaven. If he (Mr. Buckingham) were therefore called upon to suggest the fittest mode for the payment of a national priesthood, supposing that to be deemed necessary, it would be this:—He held that the time when a person entered the ministry might fairly be taken as the most worldly period of his life, and that every man who lived in the exercise of his profession as a Christian minister, ought to become less and less worldly, and more and more spiritual, the longer he lived. In proportion, therefore, as a minister devoted himself to his duty, would he wean himself from his attachment to the world. He would propose then that all persons entering the ministry of the Establishment should, in their first year, be allowed such a salary as would enable them to dress well, to dine agreeably, and to entertain their

friends; but as they went onward, as they approached higher and higher to the elevated dignities of their holy calling, as they drew nearer to heaven, and became more spiritualized, they should progressively subdue their earthly appetites. (Loud cheers.) So that at last, after passing through rectories, deaneries, and chapters, a man at the time he became a bishop, might live most temperately in every sense of the word; and when he became an archbishop, or Supreme Head of the Church, and was looked upon as a pattern of piety—then, that roots and herbs and simple water from the fountain would be his most appropriate fare. (Loud cheers, and laughter.) In every point of view, therefore, in which this matter could be regarded, he thought the present system of State Establishments and inordinate emoluments, wrong in principle, and wholly opposed to the very spirit and essence of Christianity; and believing, as he did, that both religion and good government were injured by the existing union between the Church and the State, for the sake of both he earnestly desired to see their dissolution. (Loud cheers.)

The resolution was then put from the chair, and carried with acclamations, four or five hands only being held up against it.

The Rev. Dr. BENNETT, of Silver Street Chapel, moved the following Resolution:—“That the alliance of Church and State subjects the Church to a degrading control in the appointment of its ministers and the conduct of its discipline; that it is hostile to the interests of religion, has caused persecutions, and fomented sectarian animosities; and is shown, by history and experience, to be a far less efficient provision for the instruction of the people, than would arise from leaving religion to voluntary support.” He denied that he was an enemy to the doctrines of the Established Church; on the contrary, he believed them to be true, and he also believed that the great capital articles of her creed were essential as a means of salvation. (Hear.) And it was because he did believe this, and wished to see its great doctrines disseminated—that he opposed the State connexion, because he would not see an angel that should spread her wings and fly through heaven to preach the Gospel, stand fluttering with her feet bound to the throne. (Cheers.) But, said some parties, you are an enemy to us, because you wish to seize our revenues. To such parties he might reply, that they wished to keep them, and there might be as much cupidity in wishing to keep as in wishing to get. He would be no more guilty of injustice in keeping what belonged to another, than in snatching at that which did not belong to him. He would no more take from the Established Church what was fairly her own, than he would leave in her hands what belonged to others. But it was said—Really the Church is not so very rich? He would only say, in reply, that if he wished to express a curse of refined malignity on any Church, he would say, “Let her be as rich as the Church of England.” (Hear.) He had examined the effects which the connexion of the Church with the State was producing; and he saw that it was destroying the primeval condition of Christianity. So little did many members of the Church know of its early history, and so much had others of them been mystified by designing men, that they actually believed Jesus Christ himself had tied the Church to the State. Let it be proved that the alliance with the State was Scriptural, and he would bow to it; let it be proved that there was an alliance with the State for the three first centuries of the Christian era, and he would sanction it. But such, in truth, was not the condition of the Church of Christ during those three hundred years in which it flourished in its high and palmy state, when “the glorious army of martyrs” shed their blood for Christianity; when all that were renowned in intellect, and all that were pure in heart, were ranged on the side of religion against the direct power of the world, and without any sanction from the State. Oh! let them have again their primitive Christianity: this was all they asked; for this only did they contend.

If he were asked what he meant by a separation of Church and State, he replied that his wish was to place Christianity just where Christ and his Apostles left it. In 300 years it had conquered the world, and for 1500 years since, it had not gained a step—nay, it had lost more than it had gained. (“No, no!” “yes!” and “explain!”) The Mohammedan religion now covered an immense portion of the earth, that was gained over to Christianity, before State religions

were ever established. (Hear.) Established religions had corrupted every country into which they had entered. Let them but look at them, and they would see, in proportion as their dominion had been perfected, what mischiefs had arisen from them; and they would see also, that in proportion as they had been met by another principle, which later ages had happily introduced on to the earth, these countries had been restored to a happier state. Look at the Italians! Where were the men who enlightened the world by their eloquence, and who had spread the Roman name through every clime? They were gone! And what had extinguished the genius of that land? What, but the tyranny of priestcraft? (Cheers.) Look, again, at Spain, where the principle of alliance between Church and State had become dominant. It had turned a paradise into a desert, and extinguished the finest minds and the highest intellects; it had brought the mines of Peru and Mexico to bankruptcy. And if any man told him it was the want of civil liberty which had degraded Spain, he would say that if the Church and State had not been allied, the Spanish Government and despotism also had not been allied. In this country, and in many others, we did not see the whole effects of this alliance, because toleration had shrouded it. When this same toleration was born she was a lovely dame; but she was now in an intermediate period—a sort of John the Baptist era, between the Christian and the Jewish religions. She was what the geologists would call a transition rock—a chrysalis—something between the crawling caterpillar of absolute servility, and the golden butterfly that soars in absolute freedom. (Cheers.)

Toleration had been a lovely dame, but she had lived too long, and would make a frightful old woman, something like an Egyptian mummy. Toleration, which was once a glorious word, was now a hateful word, and the Dissenter was indignant if the word were ever applied to him. The friends of the Episcopal Church in America were most decided foes to a connexion between Church and State. On an occasion when one of the Governors died, the Government decided that funeral sermons should be preached in honour of the memory of the deceased, and all parties complied except one. And who was he? Was he one of those independents who had for ages been opposed to the connexion between Church and State? No! It was Bishop Hobart, who said that if Government were allowed to dictate in one thing, it might lead to a renewal of the exploded notions of Church and State. (Hear, hear.) Hobart had been over to England, and knew, therefore, what religion suffered by such a connexion. But it was said that they must have a Church for the poor. But who did not know that the poor belonged to other religious communions? Who did not know that the poorer and middle class had long ago gone over to the Dissenters and the Methodists? He would take any ten men of the humblest walk—men who could read their Bible night and morning, who gathered their families together for worship, and who attended places of public devotion on the Lord's Day: he would take ten such men, and on asking them to what church they belonged, he would pledge himself that nine out of every ten belonged to Dissenting congregations. (Hear, hear.) If then, the poor man preferred the voluntary system—as this choice showed that he did—to have a religion devised and prepared for him by others, was it not a shame that the rich should cry out for a church supported by others, and that they should require contributions from the poor (hear!); for if the founder of the Christian religion imagined that an alliance with the State was necessary to its welfare, was it to be believed that he would never have said one word about it? And he trusted Christianity to no other support than that which it claimed from the judgment and the heart. Was it not strange that we also could not trust it to such protection? No firmer basis, he felt assured, could be devised; and he called, therefore, on all who had any regard for the honour of Christianity—for the best interests of mankind—for the welfare of the poor, and the happiness of the country—to give their vote for the severance of the alliance between Church and State. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. Wm. HOWITT, of Nottingham, having attended the Meeting with a view to the pleasure of listening, and not of talking, did not intend to do more than express his hearty concurrence in every proposition contained in the Resolution. Many worthy friends of his were fond of comparing establishments to a tree—a

tree surrounded by a dragon, and which bore golden fruit; and they imagined that it would be dangerous to pull it down at once—that they should be wise and cautious, and when the dragons were asleep lop off a bough, and take away the fruit, imagining that when they had gradually completed their design the dragons would walk away. But if they were to ask the first gardener they met, whether this was a wise or a judicious course? he would say, By no means lop off the boughs; let it bear all its fruit; let the tree become as heavy as it will, and you need then only give it a few strokes at the root, and it will be overthrown by its own weight. Of all such attempts as those of Lord John Russell, and my Lord Althorp, he confessed that he was jealous. He saw that nothing solid would be effected; and he was therefore more strongly confirmed in his original opinion, that it was better to leave the tree with all its fruit and all its pernicious influences, until they had the body of the people with them to contend against the mighty influences against which they would have to fight. From the spirit which he had seen manifested, not only at that meeting, but at several others which he had had the pleasure of attending, he felt satisfied that they had now only to go on firmly, boldly, and confidently, and that success must attend them. (Cheers.) If they maintained the spirit which had that evening been manifested, they had only to seek and they would find—to knock, and the avenues would be opened to them—to ask and it would be given. (Cheers.)

Mr. WILKES moved the following proposition:—"That the alliance of Church and State is the origin of grievances of which Dissenters now complain, in the matters of registration, marriage, burial, church rates, and exclusion from the universities; that it renders the attempts for their removal so inadequate or abortive as only to increase the discontent produced by injustice; that it is itself a great national grievance, sacrifices the peace, the liberties, and the interests of the community, to the selfishness of an ecclesiastical corporation; and that, therefore, we shall not be satisfied, nor cease to try for justice, until that unholy and pernicious alliance is totally dissolved." Could it be expected that any one having the feelings of a man, who had been educated to understand and to know what were the rights of men—whether it respected his civil or his religious liberty, could hear this enumeration of grievances, and not respond to the call which was made in this Resolution? They said—and they said with justice—that they would never get these grievances removed until the alliance between Church and State was totally dissolved. And for this simple reason—that every attempt which had been made to remove these grievances—to place every man upon a station of equality—to give every man the power to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience—had been met with a negative by the selfishness of the ecclesiastical monopolists. (Cheers.) If there had been no ecclesiastical monopoly—if there had been no alliance between Church and State, and there had been no funds to apply to the purposes of political corruption, would there have been any occasion for that meeting, or would the Dissenters for years and years have had to cry and thunder at the gates of the Legislature for equal rights, equal law, and equal liberty? (Cheers.) Let them look to the conduct of the Church; and in speaking of it, let it be remembered that they referred not to its members, but to its character as an establishment, as a political, not as a religious institution—(cheers); that whilst they had great respect for—whilst they loved its worthy and pious members—they warred against its corruptions. They testified against its monopoly because it deprived them of their liberties and plundered them under the name of religion and of God. (Cheers.) He asserted that the Church was the organ of the grievances of which Dissenters complained; for it was well observed by his reverend friend who preceded him, that if there had been no established religion there would have been no dissent. Imitating the spirit of the reformers who struggled for liberty of conscience when the Church was separated from the dominion of the Pope, he would say, in the words of the immortal Chillingworth, "The Bible—the Bible alone is the only religion of Protestants." (Cheers.) And he asserted, reading the Bible in all its parts, with the understanding and light which God had given him, he could not find any warrant, any authority, any power to establish an ecclesiastical monopoly. Looking to the early history of Christianity,

and tracing it down through the first three centuries, they found that it had lived amidst the fiercest persecutions, and ultimately triumphed and sapped the foundations of philosophy, and conquered the learning and genius of the known world. And if it did this amidst the fires of persecution—if it did this when opposed by learning, when opposed by the State, and when opposed by all the selfish and interested power of the Papacy, did he display any boldness in the assertion that it possessed a self-perpetuating energy which needed not—nay, which shrunk from any alliance with the State? (Cheers.) Believing this, and feeling for the interests of religion and the honour of his Saviour, he came forward and in His name demanded that this unholy and pernicious alliance should be totally abolished. (Cheers.)

But he had also rights as a man, and what he felt as a Christian, he had also a right to express as an Englishman. (Hear.) And why, why was he, because he dissented from the Established Church, to be excluded from the honours, the privileges, and the emoluments of the universities? Why was it that he was branded—that a stigma was cast upon him, because he exercised a right which the Protestants who founded the Established Church had contended for—that of private judgment? (Hear.) Why again, he might ask, was he called upon as a citizen and member of the State, to pay for a religion which he did not approve (cheers), and a Church from which he dissented? (Renewed cheering.) Why, every quarter, was the tithe collector seeking to extort from him a portion of his property, to uphold an alliance which he believed in his soul to be inimical to the rights, the liberties, and the happiness—present and eternal—of man? (Cheers.) Why should he be compelled to go to that Church, with all his feelings exasperated, in the moment when his happiness should be secured, to seek for the minister of a religion that he did not approve—to sanction a union which God himself had enjoined? (Hear.) Why should he, in the hour of nature's sorrow, when all his feelings were excited and lacerated, be compelled to get a stranger priest to whisper the words of consolation, or to pronounce over the graves of those he loved, the sentiments which he should rather hear from the minister whom he approved? (Cheers.) Why should he see existing in the country in which he lived, a monopoly like the present, which sought to perpetuate, to maintain, and for ever to keep alive sectarian differences and religious persecution? (Cheers.) Let them look to the history of the Church! Its steps were traced in blood (hear), and they saw in the page of history the baneful, pernicious, and unholy effects of this alliance between a Church and the State. The principles which brought the martyrs to the stake, were the principles that animated his bosom, and if the Church now possessed the power, he should be in the situation of the men who testified to the truth, and died to obtain liberty of conscience. (Cheers.) They were told that the spirit of the Church was changed—that it had ceased to persecute—that it no longer exacted from the Dissenter that which it formerly exacted—and that it tolerated every body who differed from it in opinion. He denied the allegation. (Hear.) The Church had not ceased to persecute, or if had, it was only because it had not now the power. He only last week read in the papers an instance of its intolerant and persecuting spirit. The body of a Dissenter was carried to the parish cemetery, but the haughty priest, backed by the power of ecclesiastical monopoly, refused to inter it within what he called consecrated ground. If this was not persecution, in what did it consist?

But they were told that the Church was ready to concede all reasonable claims that the Dissenters should make. Why, what arrogance was this—what insufferable arrogance did language such as this display? What man dare to tell him that he would “concede” that which God and nature, and all the laws which bound society together, told him was his right? What right had any man to use the word toleration to him? (Cheers.) He wanted—not for himself alone, but for every man breathing upon the face of the wide earth—free liberty, full liberty, absolute liberty, perfect liberty, in civil and religious affairs. (Cheers.) He asserted that, as between him and his Judge no man had a right to interfere; and he who essayed to do it—whether he excluded him from the universities, or compelled him to pay for his Church; or to come to that Church to be married, or



whether he refused the last rites over his body—he who did this, or any part of this, was animated by the same spirit that animated all the bloody persecutors of by-past times. (Cheers.) The alliance between Church and State had retarded the progress of religion, and its spirit was hostile to liberty. Look at the page of history! It presented this undoubted truth to every one—that every sect, every party, and every form of religion had uniformly been opposed to the claims of the mass of the people, and to the extension of their rights. And had it preserved religion? Religion had existed in spite of every establishment; but the moment that saw the alliance between Church and State, saw her own divine energy depart out of the Church. (Hear.) There was the form indeed, but the living spirit had fled—the vital energy that gave it power had ceased among men, and darkness, degradation, ignorance, vice, and crime speedily arose. (Cheers.) It was not until after ages—it was not until the reformers arose, and men of intellect and independence asserted the divine power of Christianity, and showed the pernicious nature of this alliance—that Christianity revived, and again received a portion of the divine energy which first made it progress through the world. For these and other reasons which he might detail he heartily moved the adoption of the Resolution. He trusted that the meeting was now aroused to rival the spirit which beat in every English bosom, and that now the people had begun to see that every monopoly, whether civil or religious—whether sanctified by time or not—was opposed to the true interests of the great mass of the people. He trusted that those whom he addressed would call upon the people to defend their rights with united voice, with an energy that could not be disputed, and with a unity of purpose that could not be defeated. That night would determine the question which was before them. Let them speak to their representatives, and tell them of the sentiments which they entertained. (Hear.) As they walked with their companions let them talk of this alteration in the Church. (Hear, hear.) Let them remember how that which would be the very soul of liberty had been used to keep them still in slavery, to ferment animosities instead of being, a bond of union, and that which should sow peace and happiness among them. (Cheers.)

Mr. J. T. RUTT was gratified with the opportunity of bearing his testimony to the importance and deep moment of this subject. Nearly half a century had elapsed since he was connected with public life, and since he appeared in the place in which he then stood; but he had never stood or spoken there upon a question which he considered of more importance than that which was then before the meeting. They must permit an old man to express the high gratification he felt in the prospect of leaving the world better than he found it. (Hear, hear.) It was at least forty years since he was engaged as a Dissenter, to act for other Dissenters, upon the question between them and the Government, when they had only to shelter themselves under the miserable protection of toleration. He was then aware, fully aware, of the difficulties which were to be found in the connexion of the State and the Church, but they had very recently been taught those difficulties, as it were, with a trumpet tongue. One part of the Resolution which he was about to second referred to the ceremony of marriage, and he might venture to say, in connection with it, that the abortive proposition which had been brought into the House of Commons had for ever disgraced the name of Russell, though he would do Lord John Russell the credit of saying, that if it had been possible for him to have introduced any other measure, he believed he would not have done as he had. (Oh, oh.) But he had the Marriage Act of 1653 before him for his guide, which made the ceremony of marriage a perfectly and entirely civil contract. Yet, with this model before him, what an abortive project he had framed! Like the ancient, he built a miserable town where he had a city in his sight. He perceived from the feeling which had been manifested by the meeting, that this question must go on. They would not be deterred, for many of them had lived long enough to see great enormities got rid of by an opposition which at first appeared to have little countenance. He need only name the overthrow of that enormity—the Slave Trade—to feel persuaded that the slavery of mind—the slavery of white men, which was formed by the union of Church and State, would ere long be abolished. (Cheers.)

The Resolution was then carried.

Mr. GRASON moved the fourth Resolution, calling on the meeting to adopt a petition founded on the preceding Resolutions. He called on the meeting not to fear the opposition of Government, and to remember that no step in either civil or religious liberty had been gained without the most desperate opposition from the ruling powers. It was true that Lord Grey had declared himself opposed to it; but they might depend upon it that Lord Grey did not consider the alliance between Church and State as one stamped with the holy sanction of religion. All that the union of Church and State meant in the mouth of Lord Grey was this—"I am Prime Minister, and my brother a Bishop." (Cheers and great laughter.)

The Rev. Mr. STOVELL seconded the motion. In his opinion the Church itself was injured by its pernicious connexion with the State. The Resolution was then carried.

A Resolution requesting the Members of Parliament who had attended the Meeting to support the Petition, was carried unanimously; and copies of the Petition were directed to be kept for some days in various parts of London, for signature.

A loud call being raised for Mr. O'Connell,

Mr. O'CONNELL rose, and said he could give but a feeble support to the prayer of the Petition, but his support would be earnest and zealous. He liked the prayer. It was a just prayer—an honest, manly prayer—a prayer deserving the applause of every man. And they might believe him when he said he would do his utmost to promote it. (Loud cheers.) It was a prayer for justice and freedom of conscience. It was a prayer that impious man should no longer interfere between him and his Creator—between his conscience and his God. Yes! he would support the prayer of their Petition! It was a prayer which he had loved in his earliest youth, when his religion was labouring under persecution; when the religion which he loved was indeed tolerated—tolerated! Talk to him of toleration. What! a worm of his own kind—a human being—a fellow creature—daring to tolerate that conscience which emanated from and owned no other law than the dictates of the Creator!—the name of "toleration" appeared to him to be more insulting and more degrading than direct persecution (so it is.) As he grew older, experience daily more and more convinced him that a Church Establishment was in its nature unfavourable to liberty. Where did they find the members of any Church Establishment advocating the destruction of partial rights and the extension of equal liberties to all. What bishop did they find of that opinion? What wealthy beneficed clergyman? What dignified pluralist ever amused his leisure by advocating the cause of the people? Would Lord Grey or the Ministers be so anxious about the connexion between the Church and State if it had a tendency to convert parsons into radicals and preachers of reform. (Hear.) If so, they would soon give up the connexion. It would much shake the force of those arguments which they at present used with so much advantage. When they could say to an Irish Chancellor, "we will make your son a Dean;" to a Member of Parliament, "we will make yours an Archdeacon;" to another man, "your uncle shall be an Archbishop!" he shrewdly suspected that no very strong arguments were necessary to obtain a very complete acquiescence in their wishes. (Hear, hear.) Yet this was the traffic continually going on, and he asked them whether such a traffic was consistent with civil freedom—whether such a traffic must not necessarily injure the best interests of religion. (Hear.) He would go further—he would imagine man who sincerely required a connexion between the Church and the State. Such a man must have come, to a foregone conclusion that his Church could not depend upon her own intrinsic merits, and that she must fall unless supported by adventitious aid.

Every Briton was entitled to civil liberty: did they possess it? Could they be said to have religious freedom—so long as they had to suffer any disability—for following the dictates of their own consciences? Did they find so absurd a principle applied to other professions? If any man came to him, and said, "I am going to law, I intend to employ Sir James Scarlett, and you shall pay for him." What would they think of the sanity of that individual? Or if any man came to him and said, "I am very sick, and must call in Sir Henry Hallford, but I'll make you pay his fee." Would they not think the patient rather in need of a Mad Doctor? Why was not the same argument to be applied to the spiritual as to

the bodily ailments? The Protestant came to him and said, "You are a Catholic and I am a Protestant; I have a particular fancy to have an Archbishop of Canterbury; I know you don't want him, but I'll make you pay for him." If he had his option, what would he, as a reasonable man, reply to these three individuals? Why, he should say to the first, that he had too much good sense to go to law; to the second, that he had too much good health to want a doctor; and to the last, that he had no possible use for the Archbishop of Canterbury: in short, that he wanted him least of all. (Great cheering.) If they had come to wrangle for some petty privileges, or to complain of some minor grievance, he would have supported them, for he would do much to gain an instalment of twopence, or even a penny in the pound. But though he would have supported them, he should not have admired them; whereas now—now that they claimed no instalment—now that they asked for the whole debt of justice, that had, been so long withheld from them, he admired their courage and respected their judgment. (Cheers.) He was not one who would ever advocate indifference to religious matters, he felt deeply the awful importance of the search after religious truth; and because he felt the great importance of that search, he desired that the road to it might be free and uninterrupted, by those legal turnpike enactments which forbade the passage to such as could not pay the toll. (Hear, hear.) He felt proud—he rejoiced—his soul expanded within him, to find that he, a Catholic, standing in the midst of so immense an assembly of sincere Protestants, could unite with them in the same pursuit, and casting aside all petty distinctions of sect, unite his energies with theirs for the attainment of that freedom of conscience, whose blessings were as universal as the air we breathe. Yes, he was proud, and let him boast of it now. There (stretching forth his right hand)—there was the hand that drew the last petition sent from Ireland to the Imperial Parliament, praying for the emancipation of Dissenters from the disabilities imposed upon them by the Test and Corporation Acts. It passed unanimously at two meetings of the Catholic Association, in the presence of, at least 20,000 of that once hostile religion. (Cheers.)

The honourable gentleman then made a passing reference to the state of the Irish Church, and the grievances which the Irish Roman Catholics, constituting 15-16ths of the population, were compelled to labour under. He was proud to see the Dissenters make a determined stand—he was proud to hear them no longer talking of toleration. Why should they longer consent to bow their heads before their fellow-men? Where was the mighty magic of a Church Establishment, which could rebuke the once stern and indomitable genius of dissent? The Dissenters of England had been the friends of liberty in many a day and many an age. They had braved cruelty, persecution, and death; they had not spared to shed their blood on the scaffold—no, nor on the field of battle, in defence of oppression, and in defence of liberty. (Tremendous applause.) Had the Dissenters of the present day degenerated from their forefathers? No! The ancient spirit had revived within them—it was for them to complete what their ancestors had begun. They would strike off the last shackle upon freedom of conscience, and establish the triumph of civil and religious liberty throughout the whole extent of this mighty empire. (Great applause.)

The Rev. GEORGE EVANS moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which Mr. HUME briefly acknowledged, and the meeting broke up at ten o'clock.

#### EVILS OF THE CORN LAWS.

The illustrations now produced will be sufficient, it is hoped, to demonstrate the manner in which the high comparative value of food in this country, counteracts all our actual and acquired superiority in producing goods for the foreign market, and brings us so near to the verge of equality with our continental rivals, as to render it impossible that our operatives should obtain any material increase of price for the quantity of work, which they perform. So long as the existing Corn Laws remain, so long will it be found impracticable, either to diminish the hours of labour, or to increase wages; and so long will every attempt to do either, inflict additional privation upon the working classes, by narrowing the foreign market, and contracting trade.—*Colonel Torrens*

## PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PAST WEEK.

THE business before both Houses has been very miscellaneous since the period to which their proceedings was brought up in our last publication. We have selected two only of the topics for our longer articles—one the Second Reading of the Poor Law Amendment Bill in the House of Commons, the other the presentation of the Glasgow Petition for a separation of the Church from the State, by Lord Brougham in the House of Peers: the other subjects may be thus briefly enumerated.

On Wednesday, May 7, the Bill for giving to the London and Westminster Bank the privileges of a corporate body, and enabling it to sue and be sued by its Secretary, was read a second time on the motion of Mr. Clay; and though opposed by Lord Althorp, was carried by a majority of 143 against 35. In the evening of the same day, Mr. W. Brougham's Metropolitan Registry Bill, and Mr. Cayley's Local Registry Bill for depositing the Deeds of Estates and registering them in one office: the first in the metropolis only, and the second in the respective counties of England and Wales, were both discussed at great length, and both rejected: Mr. Brougham's by a majority of 161 against 45; and Mr. Cayley's by a majority of 125 against 68. Mr. Berkeley's Bill for a better delivery of letters and papers by the General Post, was lost at one o'clock in the morning, by a majority of 66 to 52; and Mr. Hardy's Bill for repealing the penalties on more than twenty persons assembling together with closed doors in any private house for religious worship, was carried through a second reading at two o'clock in the morning, by a majority of 38 to 13.

On Thursday, May 8, after some discussion in the morning sitting, the Bucklebury Enclosure Bill was thrown out by an amendment of Mr. Walter, by a majority of 38 to 6. In the evening sitting, Mr. Pryme brought forward a motion for the admission of unbeneficed clergymen into the House of Commons, which, after a short discussion, was withdrawn; and Mr. Sheil introduced a motion for admitting Roman Catholics and other Dissenters to certain scholarships and professorships in Trinity College, Dublin; but the Speaker being unwell, from much recent late sitting, and there being no other constitutional mode of releasing him from his attendance, the members were apprized of this fact, and gradually left the House till it was reduced below the number of 40; when on the motion of Colonel Perceval, it was counted, and being below the proper number to form a quorum, was adjourned at half-past six accordingly.

On Friday, May 9, the Poor Law Amendment Bill underwent a long discussion, of which we have given the most material parts in a preceding article—the division for its second reading being 319 to 20.

On Monday, May 12, the House was occupied nearly the whole of the evening in the discussion of a Bill for the superannuation of Civil Officers, which passed through Committee and received several judicious improvements in its progress, by the suggestions of members

who, while they advocated true economy, did not wish to see the meritorious servants of the country in the humbler ranks unduly deprived of their fair remuneration.

On Tuesday, the 13th, the London and Southampton Railway Bill was passed through Committee, without a division, notwithstanding the somewhat strenuous opposition of Mr. Miles, one of the Members for Somersetshire, supported by Mr. Denison, one of the Members for Surrey. In the evening, Mr. Pryme withdrew his motion for the abolition of Grand Juries in England, and Mr. Hawes withdrew his for a Committee to examine into the Affairs of the British Museum; after which Mr. O'Connell brought on his motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the constitution, practices, &c., of the Inns of Court in London and Dublin. The whole discussion ultimately turned, however, on the case of Daniel Whittle Harvey, Esq., which was entered into at great length; and on which occasion Mr. Harvey made a powerful and successful defence of his case, and condemnation of the Benchers of the Inner Temple. In the course of the discussion, Sir James Scarlett, Mr. Hill, Lord Althorp, Mr. Lennard, Mr. Halcomb, Mr. C. Ferguson, Dr. Lushington, Sir F. Vincent, Mr. Pryme, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Plumptre, Sir Harry Verney, Mr. Shaw, Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Lefroy, Mr. Rolfe, Mr. Sinclair, and Sir Charles Pepys, spoke at some length, and the debate ended in the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the special case of Mr. Harvey, and to report their opinion thereupon to the House. After the article on Mr. Harvey's case and character, contained in our last Number, we need hardly say that we rejoice at this; and shall take an early opportunity to return to the subject again.

Mr. Lennard obtained leave to bring in a Bill to repeal a portion of two former Acts which inflicted the penalty of death for stealing goods, chattels, or money from another. Mr. Littleton obtained leave to bring in a Bill for improving the administration of the Civil Courts in Ireland. And Mr. Poulter obtained leave to bring in a Bill for the better observance of the Sabbath, which, with Mr. Fleetwood's in the Commons, and Lord Wynford's in the Peers, makes already three Bills sprung up from the yet warm ashes of Sir Andrew Agnew's.

Mr. W. Brougham obtained leave to bring in a Bill for the registration of all births, marriages and deaths, throughout England and Wales, upon the principle of its being purely a civil arrangement applicable to persons of all sects, and not in the least degree interfering with religious prejudices or particular ceremonies. The tax-collectors in all the counties are to be the registrars of the births and deaths; the minister who performs the marriage is to be the registrar of that event; and the whole of the returns are to be forwarded by each to a Central Office in London, for record and preservation. The plan was very clearly explained, and very generally approved; but we shall have other occasions to advert to its provisions in its progress through the House.

Sir Thomas Troubridge obtained leave to bring in a Bill for amending the laws relating to the Cinque Ports Pilots: and Dr. Nicholl obtained leave to bring in a Bill for declaring the Glasgow Lottery illegal, if continued beyond the third drawing. The proceedings were so protracted, that the House did not adjourn till nearly three o'clock, and daylight had begun to dawn as the last Members left it.

## FIRST ENTRY OF A BRITISH CONSUL INTO THE CITY OF DAMASCUS.

---

KNOWING that there are many among our readers to whom every thing connected with the extension of our Commerce in the East is of the deepest interest, we subjoin an exceedingly gratifying account of the first entry of a British Consul into the City of Damascus, which appeared in the *Times* of the 30th ultimo, with the short letter which follows it.

*From the Times, Wednesday, April 30.*

A private letter from Damascus, dated January 31, gives some interesting details of the public entry of Mr. Farren, as Consul-General, being the first British agent ever appointed to that Pachaïk. He set out from Beyrout, escorted by a large body of Lancers, and, for a considerable distance, by the Governor and his suite, as a particular mark of respect to the British Government. When within a few hours' march of the city, he was met by numerous groups of spectators, who accompanied him to the gardens of the Pacha, where the variety and magnificence of the oriental costumes of the persons assembled there, glittering in a Syrian sun, produced an effect almost unrivalled in splendour. A large number of the Janissaries of the city, on foot, preceded the cavalcade, after which followed Mr. Farren, surrounded by the dragomans; all the guards of the public places turned out and presented arms, and the infantry lined the streets through which he passed. Mr. Farren was first received by the Bey and the principal officers, and after an exchange of compliments the procession moved on to the Consulate, where the Union-jack was hoisted, to the great astonishment of the inhabitants, who gazed on it with wonder. All the streets through which they passed were lined with spectators, the windows and roofs of the houses were crowded, and the people were even standing two and three deep on the ledges of the shops; such a scene, in fact, was never, it is said, before seen in Damascus, which up to the entrance of Mr. Farren, had been kept sacred from the dress and habits of the Europeans, and being a holy city, no person until then had been allowed to enter it on horseback. The Consul-General had already been beset with requisitions for leave of audience. The commercial relations of the two countries may now, therefore, be considered as established on a firm basis, and a mine of wealth and enterprise opened by the important position of Syria with reference to the affairs and commerce of the east. Our merchants are too acute not to take advantage of this state of things, though it is said that they are likely to encounter some serious opposition from the jealousy of those who have heretofore enjoyed the monopoly of the Turkey trade. Mr. Farren owes, it is said, this appointment entirely to his own suggestions of the advantages opened to our trade by the conquest of Syria, which did not fail to obtain the immediate attention of our Ministers, who of course gave him the benefit of it.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

Sir,—I read with much interest the account given in your City Article of Wednesday, of the public entry of Mr. Farren, as British Consul, into Damascus. I rejoice at this opening of a direct intercourse for British commerce with so im-

portant a city. But as the impression likely to be conveyed by your article is that Mr. Farren was the first gentleman that called the public attention to the advantage and practicability of establishing commercial relations direct between England and Syria, you will perhaps permit me to correct the error by stating that so long ago as the year 1816, when I passed several weeks in Damascus, and made the state of its Commerce the particular object of my investigation, I placed on record my opinions as to the great benefit that would accrue from the opening a direct intercourse between England and Syria, and fixing on Damascus as the central depôt for the sale of British manufactures, which were then in great demand there, and sold at very high prices. In the year 1825 my Travels among the Arab Tribes, and in the Countries East of the River Jordan, were published in London; and, in a very full account of Damascus which that volume contained, this suggestion, as to a direct trade with it in British manufactures, is dwelt upon in several pages. I am exceedingly glad to find my suggestions at length adopted, though we have lost nine years at least of valuable time. But as it is fair that the honour, if any there be, of having been the first to make the importance of this trade publicly known, should be given to the earliest in point of date, I venture to state these facts, and having done this, I congratulate the commercial interests of England on the effects which I have no doubt the establishment of this communication between London and Damascus will eventually produce.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. S. BUCKINGHAM.

#### BUST OF ANDREW MARVELL.

In copying from the *Examiner* a description of the bust of Andrew Marvell, it was stated on the authority of that paper that it was modelled by Mr. Stevens. We are requested to say, however, that Mr. Stevens is only the inventor of the beautiful composition in which it is moulded, and which so nearly resembles marble as to be scarcely distinguishable from it, but that the bust was moulded by a very promising young artist, Mr. Pickman. We have since seen the bust ourselves, as well as the old print, of 1677, taken from the life; and we can truly say, that while the bust is inexpressibly beautiful, the likeness is very faithfully preserved, and strikingly resembles that of the equally pure patriot—the poet Milton.

#### SKETCH OF SIR GEORGE MURRAY.

Sir George Murray, the new Member for Perthshire, took the oaths and his seat in the House of Commons on Tuesday last. Our Sketch of his Life and Character was in type, and prepared for the present Number, but a press of other important matter that will not bear keeping so well, obliges us to defer this Sketch till our next Number. Our various Correspondents will also, we hope, indulge us with their patience till then.

#### DIVISIONS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

We beg to inform our Correspondent, H. G., at Croydon, that as there are no means provided by the House for taking Divisions at all, it is very difficult to obtain any, since they are all taken by individual Members, interested in each separate question. Many cases occur, however, in which Lists of a Majority cannot be made out with any degree of accuracy whatever, especially when it is a large one, as the party who are supposed by the Speaker to form the Minority, go out of the House, and their names can therefore be more easily taken down, while those who remain in, not removing at all from their seats, their names cannot be taken down but by one of their own party; and they are mostly either adverse or

indifferent to having their names published at all. Our readers may be assured, that whatever Divisions are taken on either side we shall be sure to procure them and give them publicity; and we only regret that the House has not some official means provided for publishing an accurate List of the Majority and Minority in every Division that occurs.

### • PRICES CURRENT, AND GENERAL NEWS.

Some friends at Rochdale, we learn, are very desirous of our giving a Weekly Price Current in the *Review*: and from other places we have been solicited to give the News of the Week, the Gazette of Bankrupts, the Births, Marriages, and Deaths of distinguished individuals, &c. To all these we have one uniform answer, which is, that at the present moment we find our space already too confined for what we are pledged to publish: and that we cannot add to this space without an increase of price, which we do not wish to impose, or a weekly pecuniary loss, which none of our readers can, we hope, desire to inflict. We had an opportunity this week of making a comparison between the price of the *Review* and other popular Periodicals; and a statement of the difference will not be disadvantageous to us. Take the *United Service Journal*, a Monthly Publication of very extensive sale and great popularity. Its price is 3s. 6d., for which nine sheets, of sixteen pages each, are furnished, or at the rate of nearly 5d. per sheet. The price of the *Review* is 6d. for two sheets and a-half, of sixteen pages each, or about 2½d. each, *just half the price only*, quantity compared with quantity, of the *United Service Journal*. It was a great error, though a disinterested and a well intended one, to reduce the price of this *Review*; for though the circulation is much larger than before, the price admits of no profits, and the Editor has, as the phrase is, "only his labour for his pains." Though the price of the Work to the buyer is Sixpence per Number, yet, to the Editor, it is little more than half that sum, out of which all the expenses of printing, paper, advertising, &c., are to be paid, to say nothing of the labour;—for the deduction of 25 per cent. to the retail booksellers, of 8 per cent. to wholesale publishers, every 13th copy being given free, of 7 per cent., the amount of carriage to country agents, and of other incidental charges, amounting to between 40 and 50 per cent. before it ends. Our readers will see therefore that adding any thing to the Work beyond its present compass of contents, would be an act of injustice to ourselves, for which we could furnish no excuse.

### EFFECTS OF MACHINERY.

Machines work, but do not eat. When they displace labour, and render it disposable, they at the same time displace and render disposable the real wages, the food and clothing, which maintained it. The aggregate fund for the support of labour is not diminished; and therefore, unless the numbers to be maintained should increase, each individual, as soon as the free subsistence and free labour are readjusted to each other, will have the same command of the necessaries of life as before. But machines not only leave the aggregate fund for the maintenance of labour undiminished, they actually increase it. They are employed, because they reduce productive cost; and whether such reduction take place in agriculture, or in manufactures, it allows cultivation to extend over districts which could not otherwise be tilled, and causes additional funds for the maintenance of labour to be created. When a machine is employed in agriculture, the quantity of food and clothing expended in raising a given produce is reduced; and when it is employed in manufactures, the value of the clothing and implements expended in raising a given produce is reduced; and therefore, in either case the plough is driven over regions into which cultivation could not otherwise extend—the same effect is produced as if increased natural fertility had descended on the soil—the fund for the maintenance of labour is enlarged, and the same numbers will obtain higher wages, or additional numbers will obtain employment.—  
*Colonel Torrens.*



## DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

## MINORITY of 234,

Tellers included, who, on the 5th of May, voted for Mr. Strutt's amendment, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Pensions charged on the Civil List and on the Consolidated Fund, in order to ascertain the nature and extent of any abuses which may have occurred in the granting of the said Pensions, with a view of giving full effect to the resolutions of this House of the 18th of February last."

## ENGLAND.

Adams, E. H.	Dundas, Captain	James, W.	Romilly, J.
Aglionby, H. A.	Dykes, F. L.	Jervis, J.	Seale, Colonel
Astley, Sir J. D.	Edwards, J.	Kennedy, J.	Scholesfield, J.
Attwood, T.	Ellis, W.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Scott, J. W.
Baillie, J. E.	Etwall, R.	Langton, Col. G.	Scrope, C. P.
Bainbridge, E. T.	Evans, Col.	Leech, J.	Simeon, Sir R.
Baines, E.	Ewart, W.	Lefevre, C. S.	Shawe, R. N.
Barnard, E. G.	Faithfull, G.	Lennard, T. B.	Spry, S. T.
Bennet, J.	Fielden, W.	Lennox, Lord G.	Stanley, F. J.
Beauclerk, Major	Fielden, J.	Lennox, Lord A.	Staveley, T. K.
Berkeley, Hon. G.	Fellowes, H. A. W.	Leunor, Lord W.	Tancred, H. W.
Berkeley, Hon. C.	Ferguson, Sir R.	Lester, B. L.	Tennyson, Hon. C.
Bewes, F.	Fenton, J.	Lister, E. C.	Thicknesse, R.
Bish, T.	Fleetwood, H.	Lloyd, J. H.	Thompson, Ald.
Blackburne, J.	Fort, J.	Locke, W.	Todd, R.
Blake, Sir F.	Fryer, R.	Maddocks, J.	Tollemache, Hon. G.
Blamire, W.	Gaskell, D.	Marryat, J.	Tooke, W.
Blandford, Marquis	Godson, R.	Martin, J.	Torrens, Colonel
Blunt, Sir C.	Goring, H. D.	Methuen, P.	Townshend, Lord C.
Boss, Captain	Grote, G.	Mills, J.	Trelawney, W. L. S.
Bouverie, Hon. D.	Guest, J. J.	Molesworth, Sir W.	Turner, W.
Bowes, T.	Guise, Sir B. W.	Moreton, Hon. A. H.	Tynte, J. K.
Briggs, R.	Gully, J.	Morrison, J.	Vernon, Hon. G.
Briscoe, J. I.	Hall, B.	Ord, W. H.	Vincent, Sir F.
Brocklehurst, J.	Halse, J.	Parker, J.	Vivian, J. H.
Brodie, W. B.	Handley, B.	Parrott, J.	Walter, J.
Brotherton, J.	Handley, H.	Pease, J.	Warburton, H.
Buckingham, J. S.	Hardy, J.	Pendarves, E. W.	Wason, R.
Bulwer, E. L.	Harvey, D. W.	Petre, Hon. E.	Watkins, J. L. V.
Cayley, E. G.	Hawes, B.	Phillips, M.	Watson, R.
Chaytor, Sir W.	Hawkins, J. H.	Phillipotts, J.	Whalley, Sir S.
Clay, W.	Heathcote, J.	Plumtre, J. P.	Wilbraham, G.
Codrington, Sir E.	Hill, M. D.	Potter, R.	Wilks, John
Collier, J.	Hodges, T. L.	Poulter, J. S.	Williams, Col.
Curteis, E. B.	Hoskins, K.	Pryme, G.	Williams, W.
Curteis, H. B.	Hudson, T.	Pryse, P.	Wilmot, Sir E.
Dashwood, G. H.	Hughes, H.	Ramsbottom, J.	Windham, W. H.
Davies, Col.	Hume, J.	Rickards, J.	Winnington, H. J.
Dawson, E.	Humphery, J.	Rickford, W.	Wood, Aldermen
Denison, W. J.	Hurst, R. H.	Rider, T.	Yelverton, W. H.
Dick, Q.	Hutt, W.	Rippon, C.	Young, G. F.
Dillwyn, L. W.	Ingham, R.	Robinson, G. R.	
Divet, E.	Ingilby, Sir W.	Roebuck, J. A.	

## SCOTLAND.

Abercromby, Hon. J. Gillen, W. D.	Oswald, W. A.	Sharpe, General
Bannerman, A.	Johnston, A.	Sinclair, D.
Dunlop, Captain	Maxwell, J.	Stewart, Sir M. S.
Ewing, J.	Murray, J. A.	Wallace, R.
Fergusson, R. C.	Oliphant, L.	Wemyss, Captain

## IRELAND.

Baldwin, Dr.	Fitzsimon, C.	O'Connell, C.	Ruthven, E.
Barry, G. S.	Fitzsimon, N.	O'Connell, M.	Sheil, R. L.
Bellew, R. M.	French, F.	O'Connell, M.	Sullivan, R.
Blackney, W.	Grattan, H.	O'Connor Don	Talbot, J. H.
Blake, J.	Jephson, C. D. O.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Vigors, N. A.
Butler, Hon. P.	Lalor, P.	O'Ferrall, R. M.	Walker, C. A.
Callaghan, D.	Lynch, A. H.	O'Reilly, W.	Wallace, T.
Chapman, M. L.	Macnamara, F.	Roche, W.	
Copeland, Alderman	Macnamara, Major	Roche, D.	Tellers.
Evans, G.	Nagle, Sir R.	Roynane, D.	Strutt, E.
Finn, W. F.	O'Brien, C.	Ruthven, E. T.	Romilly, E.
Fitzgerald, J.	O'Connell, D.		

For the Amendment, 234.—Against it, 315.

## PENSION LIST.

A List of the 84 Members, who, on the 5th of May, voted for Mr. Strutt's amendment to refer the Pension List to a Committee, having previously voted against Mr. D. W. Harvey's Motion for its revision by the Ministers of the Crown.

## ENGLAND.

Astley, Sir J. D.	Ewart, W.	Martin, J.	Shawe, R. N.
Baines, E.	Ferguson, Sir R.	Moreton, Hon. A. H.	Simeon, Sir R.
Benett, J.	Guise, Sir B. W.	Morrison, J.	Staveley, J. K.
Blackburne, J.	Hawes, B.	Ord, W. H.	Thicknesse, R.
Blunt, Sir C.	Hawkins, J. H.	Parker, J.	Thompson, W.
Bouverie, Captain	Hodges, T. L.	Pendarves, E. W.	Todd, J. R.
Briscoe, J. I.	Hurst, R. H.	Petre, Hon. E.	Torrens, Colonel
Brocklehurst, J.	Ingham, R.	Phillipotts, J.	Townshend, Lord C.
Brodie, W. B.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Plumptre, J. P.	Vernon, Hon. G.
Cayley, E. G.	Lefevre, C. S.	Poulter, J. S.	Vivian, J. H.
Dawson, E.	Lennard, T. B.	Pryne, G.	Wilbraham, G.
Denison, W. J.	Lennox, Lord G.	Pryse, Pryse	Windham, W. H.
Dick, Q.	Lennox, Lord A.	Rider, T.	Winnington, H. J.
Dillwyn, L. W.	Lloyd, J. H.	Romilly, J.	Yelverton, Hon. W.
Divett, E.	Locke, W.	Scott, J. W.	Young, G. F.
Dundas, Captain	Madocks, J.	Seale, Colonel	

## SCOTLAND.

Abercromby, J.	Fergusson, R. C.	Murray, J. A.	Sinclair, G.
Banferman, A.	Johnston, A.	Pringle, R.	Stewart, Sir M.
Dunlop, J.	Maxwell, J.	Sharpe, General	Wemyss, Captain
Ewing, J.			

## IRELAND.

Callaghan, D.	Jephson, C.	O'Connor Don	Tellers.
Evans, G.	Macnamara, Major	Walker, C. A.	Strutt, E.
			Romilly, E.

The Member, who voted for the original motion and against the amendment—  
Ketch, B.

## MINORITY OF 37,

Tellers included, who, on the 7th of May, voted against the second reading of the Bill to enable the Proprietors of the London and Westminster Bank Company to sue and be sued by their Secretary.

Althorp, Lord	Gronow, R. H.	Martin, J.	Weyland, Major R.
Baring, F. T.	Gladstone, T.	Marjoribanks, S.	Winnington, Sir T.
Buxton, T. F.	Hodges, T. L.	Mangles, J.	Wrottesley, Sir J.
Barnew, J.	Howard, P. H.	Parker, Sir H.	Ward, H.
Biddulph, R.	Hurst, R. H.	Russell, Lord J.	Wall, B.
Bulkeel, J. C.	Lyall, G.	Robarts, A. W.	
Crawford, W.	Lennox, Lord G.	Smith, J.	Tellers.
Fielden, J.	Madocks, J.	Smith, J. A.	Thompson, Alderman
Finch, G.	Mills, J.	Smith, V.	Reid, Sir J.
Foley, J. H.			

For the Bill, 145—Against it, 37.

## MINORITY of 70,

Tellers included, who, on the 7th of May, voted for the second reading of Mr. E. S. Cayley's Bill for the Registration of Deeds, in the respective Counties of England and Wales, and not in the Metropolis.

Agnew, Sir A.	Fox, J. L.	James, W.	Sharpe, General
Baines, E.	Gaskell, D.	Jephson, C. D. O.	Staveley, T. K.
Barron, H. W.	Goring, H. D.	Johnstone, Sir J.	Strickland, Sir G.
Bish, T.	Grosvenor, Lord	Johnston, A.	Talbot, C. R. M.
Blake, M.	Grote, G.	Langdale, Hon. C.	Thicknesse, R.
Blunt, Sir C.	Gully, J.	Lister, A. C.	Tollemache, Hon. A.
Briggs, R.	Hardy, J.	Madocks, J.	Vernon, Sir H.
Briscoe, J. I.	Harland, W. C.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Vernon, Hon. G.
Brocklehurst, J.	Hawkins, J. H.	Ord, W. H.	Wallace, R.
Brotherton, J.	Hay, Sir J. I.	Palmer, C. F.	Wilbraham, G.
Chapman, A.	Howard, W. R.	Parker, J.	Williams, Colonel
Crompton, J. S.	Howard, Captain	Pepys, Sir C.	Yelverton, H. W. II.
Dalmeny, Lord	Howard, P. H.	Pease, J.	Young, G. F.
Dillwyn, L. W.	Hutt, W.	Pryme, G.	
Dykes, F. L. B.	Hyett, W. H.	Rider, T.	Tellers.
Elliot, Captain	Ingham, R.	Rolfe, R. M.	Morpeth, Lord
Fleetwood, H.	Ingilby, Sir W.	Sandon, Lord	Cayley, W.
Fort, J.			

For the Bill, 70—Against it, 127.

## MINORITY OF 47,

Tellers included, who, on the 7th of May, voted in favour of the second reading of Mr. W. Brougham's Bill for the General Registration of Deeds in the Metropolis.

Adams, E. H.	Grosvenor, Lord R.	Potter, R.	Wood, G. W.
Aglionby, H. A.	Grate, G.	Rolfe, R. M.	Yelverton, H. W. II.
Baillie, J. E.	Hawes, B.	Romilly, J.	
Barron, W.	Hawkins, J. H.	Romilly, E.	Tellers.
Blunt, Sir C.	Horne, Sir W.	Smith, J. A.	Brougham, W.
Briscoe, J. I.	Hyett, W. H.	Smith, V.	Fergusson, C.
Bouverie, Hn. D. P.	Jephson, O.	Talbot, C. R. M.	
Childers, J. W.	Johnston, A.	Thicknesse, R.	PAIRED OFF.
Dalmeny, Lord	Lloyd, J. H.	Tollemache, R. G.	Lord Advocate
Dashwood, G. H.	Lushington, Dr.	Vernon, Hon. G. I.	Stanley, Hon. H.
Dillwyn, L.	Lynch, A. H.	Wallace, R.	Stewart, E.
Elliot, Captain	Ord, W. H.	Walter, J.	Strutt, E.
Ewart, W.	Palmer, F.	Warburton, H.	Kerry, Lord
Fort, J.	Pepys, Sir C.		

For the Bill, 47—Against it, 163.

## SALARIES OF SCOTCH JUDGES.

Minority of 14, Tellers included, who, on the 7th of May, voted against Mr. Sinclair's motion for a Committee to consider how far the salaries of the judges of Scotland are commensurate with their duties.

Blake, M.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Sullivan, R.	
Brotherton, J.	Pease, J.	Talbot, J. H.	Tellers.
Lalor, P.	Ruthven, E.	Walter, J.	Ruthven, E. S.
Maxwell, J.	Sheil, R. L.	Walker, C.	Gillon, W. D.

## CRICKLEY HILL, AND CAMPFIELD ROAD BILL.

Minority of 29, Tellers included, who, on the 9th of May, in the morning sitting, voted for the second reading of this Bill.

Bethell, R.	French, F.	Langton, Colonel	Turner, W.
Brotherton, J.	Guise, Sir B. W.	Lister, E. C.	Thicknesse, R.
Butler, Colonel	Goring, H. D.	Milton, Viscount	Villiers, Lord
Cayley, E.	Gully, J.	Mangles, J.	
Dalmeny, Lord	Hawes, B.	Pease, J.	Tellers.
Evans, Colonel	Heathcoat, J.	Rotch, B.	Norreys, Lord
Estcourt, T. G. B.	Henniker, Lord	Sanford, E.	Hughes, H.
Finn, W. F.	Holdsworth, T.	Shawe, R. N.	

For the Bill, 29—Against it, 22.

## BUCKLEBURY ENCLOSURE BILL.

Majority of 40, Tellers included, who, on the 8th of May, voted against the Report of the Committee on the Bucklebury Enclosure Bill.

Bethell, R.	Goring, H. D.	Lynch, A. H.	Scholefield, J.
Brotherton, J.	Hawkes, B.	Mangles, J.	Smith, V.
Butler, Colonel	Hume, J.	Milton, Lord	Turner, W.
Cayley, E.	Hardy, J.	O'Dwyer, A. C.	Thicknesse, R.
Conolly, Colonel	Hodgson, J.	Philips, Sir G.	Villiers, Lord
Dalmeny, Lord	Heathcoat, J.	Pease, J.	Walter, J.
Evans, Colonel	Henniker, Lord	Pryme, G.	
Estcourt, T. G. B.	Houldsworth, T.	Rotch, B.	Tellers.
Finn, W. F.	Hughes, H.	Sanford, E.	Palmer, C. F.
French, E.	Langton, G.	Shawe, R. N.	Throckmorton, R.
Gully, J.	Lister, E. C.		

Minority of 8, who, on the 9th of May, in the morning sitting, voted in favour of this Bill.

Duffield, T.	Guise, Sir B. W.	Norreys, Lord	Tellers.
Dundas, Captain	Moreton, H.	Winnington, Sir T.	Walter, J.
			Pryme, G.

For the Bill, 8—Against it, 40.

## MINORITY OF 22,

Tellers included, who, on the 9th of May, voted against the second reading of the Poor Laws Amendment Bill.

## ENGLAND.

Attwood, T.	Evans, Colonel	Faithfull, G.	Vyryan, Sir R.
Attwood, M.	Fryer, R.	Halse, J.	Walter, J.
Beaucherk, Major	Fildes, J.	Scholefield, J.	Whalley, Sir S.

## IRELAND.

Lalor, P.	Ruthven, E. S.	O'Connell, M.	O'Connell, C.
Ronayne, D.	O'Connell, D.	O'Connell, M.	Vigors, N. A.
Ruthven, E.			

For the Bill, 321—Against it, 22.

## MINORITY OF 30,

Teller included, who, on the 12th of May, voted on Colonel Davies's Motion, that the Pensions of the higher Officers of the State should not be granted until after a period of Five Years' Service, instead of Two, as proposed in the Bill.

Barnard, E. G.	Fort, J.	O'Connell, D.	Tooke, W.
Bellew, R. M.	Gaskell, D.	O'Connor, Don	Turner, W.
Brotherton, J.	Gordon, R.	O'Dwyer, C.	Wason, R.
Callaghan, D.	Guest, J. J.	Oswald, R. A.	Whalley, Sir S.
Codrington, Adml.	Hodgson, J.	Parrott, J.	Wilbraham, G.
Fenton, J.	Jervis, J.	Potter, R.	Young, G. F.
Fergusson, R. C.	Lester, B. L.	Ruthven, E. S.	Teller.
Fitzgerald, T.	Lister, E. C.	Ruthven, E.	Davies, Colonel

## CHRISTCHURCH, SURREY, RECTOR'S BILL.

Majority of 76, Tellers included, who, on the 12th of May, voted against the second reading of the Christchurch, Surrey, Rector's Bill.

Aglionby, H. A.	Evans, G.	Marsland, T.	Sandford, Sir D. K.
Blackburne, J.	Fort, J.	Methuen, P.	Shawe, N.
Bish, T.	Fenton, J.	O'Connor, Don	Skipwith, Sir G.
Briggs, R.	Fleetwood, H.	O'Dwyer, C.	Torrans, Colonel
Brotherton, J.	Folkes, Sir W.	O'Brien, C.	Turner, W.
Benett, J.	Goring, H. D.	Oswald, R. A.	Tynte, J. K.
Blake, Sir F.	Gully, J.	Parrott, J.	Wallace, R.
Codrington, Sir E.	Guest, J. J.	Potter, R.	Warburton, H.
Childers, J. W.	Hornby, E. G.	Philips, M.	Ward, H. G.
Crawford, W.	Harland, W. C.	Pryme, G.	Wason, R.
Curteis, H. B.	Humphery, J.	Phillipotts, J.	Whalley, Sir S.
Curteis, E. B.	Hill, M. D.	Rippon, C.	Williams, Colonel
Divett, E.	Hawes, B.	Richards, J.	Williams, A.
Darlington, Lord	Hodges, J.	Romilly, J.	Wilmot, Sir E.
Dillwyn, L. W.	Halyburton, Hon. G.	Ruthven, E.	Vincent, Lord
Dobbin, L.	Jervis, J.	Ruthven, E. S.	
Ellis, W.	Kennedy, T.	Roche, W.	Tellers.
Elliot, Captain	Lloyd, H.	Stanley, Hon. H. T.	Hall, B.
Evans, Colonel	Lister, E. C.	Staffley, E. J.	Beauclerk, Major
Evans, W.	Lalor, P.	Scholefield, J.	

Minority of 35, tellers included, who voted for the second reading of the Christchurch Rector's Bill.

Astley, Sir J. D.	Gaskell, J. M.	Irton, S.	Smith, T. R.
Barnard, E. G.	Gladstone, W. E.	Lincoln, Earl of	Yorke, Captain
Blackstone, W. S.	Gladstone, T.	Loch, J.	
Browne, D.	Goulburn, H.	Maxwell, H.	Paired Off.
Brudenell, Lord	Grimston, Viscount	Nicholl, J.	Chandos, Marquis of
Chapman, A.	Halcomb, J.	Palmer, R.	Miles, W.
Clayton, Sir W.	Halford, H.	Reid, Sir J. R.	
Dunlop, Captain	Hammer, Colonel	Ross, C.	Tellers.
Finch, G.	Hawkes, T.	Scott, Sir E. D.	Knatchbull, Sir F.
Foley, F.	Hughes, W. H.	Sinclair, G.	Estcourt, T. G. B.
Fremantle, Sir T.			

## POOR LAW BILL.

List of the Minority of 19, tellers included, who, on Thursday the 15th of May, at One o'Clock in the Morning, voted for the adjournment of the Debate on the first Reading of the Poor Law Amendment Bill, giving existence to the Central Board of Commissioners.

Aglionby, H. A.	Fielden, J.	Jervis, J.	Williams, Colonel
Attwood, T.	Godson, R.	Lloyd, J.	Young, G. F.
Buckingham, J. S.	Gully, J.	Robinson, G. R.	Tellers.
Ewart, W.	Hughes, H.	Scholefield, J.	Evans, Colonel
Faithfull, G.	Hatcox, J.	Walter, J.	Whalley, Sir S.

For the Adjournment, 13; Against it, 321.

C. Whiting, Beaufort House, Strand.

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1834.

SKETCH OF SIR GEORGE MURRAY, THE NEWLY-  
ELECTED M. P. FOR PERTHSHIRE.

THE return of Sir George Murray, for Perthshire, is another blow to the Ministry. They have had warnings the first and second, which have been both disregarded; the present affair is warning the third; after which comes the grim tyrant with his scythe, mowing down those weak in the flesh. At the bottom of the contest in Perthshire there lurked a job; we, therefore, greatly rejoice that the incipient Lord of the Treasury has been nipped in the bud of his would-be career. When your Scotch official buds come to blossom out fully, it is a sore blight for poor Old England. The career of Dundas and Melville bear witness to this sad truth. In the Perth election there is one man whom we sincerely pity, and that is the brave and gallant Lynedoch. Surely this glorious veteran could be no party to the doings of his nephew and heir, Mr. Græme. It would be a strange and unseemly sight, to see an old companion in arms—one who had often fought in the same field, and under the same commander as Sir George Murray—who had shared in the same triumphs and partook of the same victories—spurring on his nephew to oust a brother soldier from the representation of a county to which his high talents and long services give him the best and fairest pretensions. Who has ever before heard of Mr. Græme? In what field has he foughten—in what forum has he been heard—in what bureau has he served? We can find no record of his deeds any where, and all that the Treasury scribes can say of him is, that he is the nephew of Lord Lynedoch, but surely Lord Lynedoch has never encouraged him to contest the county with Sir George Murray. Ancient friendship—the appreciation of high services—forbid the unworthy supposition. The truth we suspect is, that Lord Lynedoch's name has been used, or rather abused, by the Whigs, to their own party purposes. They made the popularity of the distinguished soldier the mask to cover their own selfish designs; but it is consoling to think they have been defeated.

Sir George Murray, the subject of the present Sketch, was born on the other side of the Tweed, about sixty years ago. We believe he re-

ceived the first rudiments of his education at either Eton or Harrow from whence he was early transferred to a regiment of Foot Guards. The Guards at this time were chiefly composed of the "*dolce far niente*" school of warriors. The men of the line used deridingly to call them the "feather-bed soldiers;" and as they never left London, and were generally more remarkable for figuring in the *minuette de la cour* than for couching the lance or leading the forlorn hope, the *stubriquet* was not without point. How the regiments of Guards degenerated from the time when Marlborough was an ensign in their ranks it is not our purpose here to describe. They were then (1666), in fine military *tenue*; but we believe, even at that epoch, they were not employed in foreign service; for we find that Ensign Churchill left England as a volunteer to join the forces at Tangier, and soon after accompanied the contingent of 6000 men, which, under the command of the Duke of Monmouth, quitted England to attack Holland. Churchill afterwards became a captain in Monmouth's regiment, leaving the original one to which he belonged, for the line. We notice this circumstance merely to state, that Sir George Murray pursued an exactly similar course. Finding the Guards' duty inactive, and wholly domestic, he exchanged into the line, and was not long without that employment for which his active mind thirsted. In any thing we have just said, we mean to cast no aspersion on the gallant regiments of Guards. They nobly vindicated their claim to the title of soldiers in the Peninsula and at Waterloo; and if before this period they were made wholly household troops the fault was not theirs.

Sir George Murray's first services were, we believe, in one of our West India Islands, on his return from which, he accompanied, if we mistake not, the Duke of York into Holland. On the breaking out of the French war, Sir George was again employed. He served with marked distinction for some time, and at length became attached to the staff of Sir John Erskine, whose widow, Lady Louisa, he afterwards married. It was, however, in the Peninsula that his laurels grew into full bloom. Here he not only distinguished himself as a brilliant executive, but also as an administrative officer of the first class. As Quartermaster-General to the Duke of Wellington he won not only "golden opinions" from his great commander, but also from "the whole camp, pioneers and all."

The situation of Quartermaster-General was, during the Spanish campaign, one of peculiar delicacy and difficulty. The greatest tact, the most scrupulous exactness, the most unremitting industry, were by turns required at the hands of the individual who presided over this department of the service; and when we state that in no one of these requisites was Sir George found wanting, we but write his just eulogium, and account in part for the uniform and brilliant successes which followed the British arms throughout the campaign. In this responsible office, Sir George "bore his faculties so meekly"—he performed his duties so kindly, considerately, and at the same time so conscientiously, and with so much suavity—as to satisfy even the civil officers of the Commissariat; a race of men always prone to find fault, and to shift the burden of blame to any shoulders but their own.

The attribute of courage is with most men, an instinct rather than a virtue—the knowledge of military tactics and strategic are arts, a high

proficiency in which may be acquired by a very ordinary understanding; but it is not to all men to whom is given the power of managing civil details—the ability to acquire an ascendancy over the minds of others—and the tact to maintain that ascendancy, by the continued exhibition of good temper, and conciliation, and a thorough knowledge, not only of the strength and weakness of your own case, but of that of your opponents. It is easy enough to procure men who will mount the “imminent deadly breach” to seek the “bubble reputation, even at the cannon’s mouth”—it is a common thing to find in all countries abundance of martinets and manœuverers—the drill sergeants of the human race, as Anacharsis Cloutz<sup>was</sup> its orator—but it is not every day we discover the capacity to command—the depth and breadth of mind to view the whole of a subject, as well in its great bearings as in its smaller details;—still more rarely do we meet that higher genius which speaks to the soul of men in the hour of danger—which with eagle eye sees the fault of an opponent and takes instantaneous advantage of it—which turns the very household virtues of troops to warlike purposes—and makes the army have but one will, which is that of the commander, and one only thought and object, which is victory. These were the qualities exhibited by Hannibal and Cæsar, in the olden time—by Cromwell, Massena, Napoleon, and (in lesser degree) by Marlborough, among the moderns. Many of these qualities are possessed too by Sir George Murray, and if he has not given proof of the very highest of them, it is, in our mind, rather from the absence of occasion and opportunity, than from the want of that *divinè matériel* which we are wont to call genius.

Should, however, the occasion arise (which Heaven forbid!)—should a civil war again rage, as in the time of the Commonwealth, we confess we look to Sir George Murray as one of the few—perhaps one of the two military men—capable of rescuing this country from great calamities. The other individual is already known as the soldier, the scholar, and the eloquent historian of a campaign, in which he bore a distinguished part; and if he be not known as the politician too, the reproach is that of the new constituencies, for it in no degree attaches to Colonel Napier himself.

Let us not be understood as detracting from the military renown of the hero of Waterloo. He is, no doubt, the greatest military commander of his age and country; but it would be gross flattery to aver that he ever had, or ever can have, the high civil and administrative talents—the eloquence, the rare insight into the spirit of our own time, and the learned comparative views of past social history and institutions—the absence from religious and political prejudice—and that candour of mind which is the first requisite to a searcher after truth, all of which are possessed in the highest degree by the gifted Member for Perthshire.

But although the Duke cannot boast of the high order of mind of his brother soldier, he, nevertheless, deserves the greatest credit for having anxiously seized every occasion, since the peace to place, Sir George Murray in those situations in which his talents might be rendered alike advantageous to himself and conducive to the public service. It was at the sole and strong recommendation of the Duke, that Lord Liverpool sent Sir George Murray, as Commander-in-chief, to Ireland,



a situation, which, in a disturbed country, and in a very troublous season, he filled with a union of calmness, force, and efficiency, honourable to his own temper and discretion, and creditable to that uniform sagacity, of which his Grace of Wellington has given so many proofs. The reputation of Sir George has long survived his departure from that hapless land, where discord seems perennial, and where the holiest gifts of nature seem to have been distributed only to be destroyed by the perverse passions incident to humanity, placed on the one hand in a position of unjust dominion, and on the other of dissatisfied obedience.

While filling, in 1825, the responsible office of Commander-in-chief, in the sister-country, Sir George, in opposition, we believe, to the expressed wishes of a majority of his constituents, arrived in England, to support by his vote the annual motion made on behalf of the Emancipation of the Irish Catholics. Always favourable to the extension of civil and religious liberty, he did not, on this occasion, allow the trammels of office, or the ties of party, to interfere with his deliberately-formed conviction, and though the Premier was known to be hostile to concession, and Sir George's patron, the commander of the Irish Commander-in-chief, to be still more averse to give way—yet, in the teeth of these official demonstrations, the Member for Perthshire—disregarding alike patrons and constituents—did his duty to his country as an independent and enlightened member of the Senate of a free deliberative assembly.

Shortly after this period, Sir George was withdrawn from the command in Ireland. He continued to perform his duties as a member of Parliament, and as Colonel of the 43d Regiment, during the year 1827, and part of 1828. When, towards the close of the latter year, the Duke of Wellington was invested with the sword of state, Sir George was appointed to the high and important office of Secretary for the Colonies. During the whole period of his Grace's administration he continued to hold the portfolio of this department, and we believe we but echo the general opinion when we state that his conciliatory measures, and his attention, alike to the reclamations of master and slave, procured him the respect of the one and the warm wishes of the other. Comparisons are chiefly odious to those to whose disadvantage they are drawn. But even at the risk of dispraising Mr. Stanley, we cannot forbear placing the calm conciliating demeanour of Sir George Murray, and the firm yet peaceable temper and guarded moderation of his state papers, in disadvantageous contrast with the fiery measures and intemperate despatches of our Colonial Secretary. Of the senatorial talents of Mr. Stanley there are few that entertain a higher opinion than ourselves, but it is not because a man is sharp and subtle in debate—it is not because he is fluent, forcible, and master of the science of Parliamentary logic—that he is an able minister; for one of the wisest of men, Lord Bacon, has said, that "Discretion of speech is more than eloquence; and to speak agreeably with whom we deal, is more than to speak in good words or in good order." Sir George Murray is always discreet and agreeable of tongue—Mr. Stanley is neither the one nor the other. There is a waywardness and self-opinion—a temerity, a rashness, and a want of temper in all he says and writes, which is of unhappy augury for his future fame, and which may be very ruinous to his country. Already has Ireland been chafed by his peevish vanity; and

the Canadas are now tearing asunder the rampant ordinances of the Colonial Office, and proclaiming aloud their disobedience. The Governor, Lord Aylmer, has been impeached, and the Colonial Secretary is paid back with interest, the reproaches which he issued forth from Carlton Gardens. Had Sir George Murray been at the Colonial Office, we should have had just as much of the *fortiter in re*, and a great deal more of the *suaviter in modo*.

It may be said that in thus writing, we are unconsciously advocating the cause of the Tories: This we take leave to deny. We are not, however, so blinded by considerations of party, as to give to a Whig Secretary a merit which he does not deserve, or to detract from one, who when in office was distinguished by none of the bigotry of the Tories; and who now, when out of office, displays ten times as much liberality as the Whigs themselves. Though Sir George Murray formed a part of the Duke of Wellington's administration, yet it would be unfair to call him a Tory on that ground alone. Three or four men in the present cabinet—or at least forming a part of the Whig Government—were also a part of the Duke of Wellington's government; yet we fancy that Earl Ripon, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Charles and Robert Grant, would be very little obliged to any one who should now call them Tories on that ground. Let us judge men by their words and acts; and who that has read the recent declarations of Sir George, on the subject of the admission of Dissenters to the universities, coupling it with the general moderation of his sentiments and opinions, can refuse to him the praise of being a man whose general views are eminently in harmony with the spirit of the times in which he lives. It may be replied that the gallant General opposed the Reform Bill. True, he did; and we regret it, even though we believe that his opposition was most conscientious; but let any one who cavils at this passage in his public life, compare the mode and manner of his opposition with that of the generality of Tories, and he will find the wide difference existing between a factious and an ingenuous and candid opposition.

At the dissolution which followed the passing of the Reform Bill, Sir George contested his native county against the present Marquis of Breadalbane, then Lord Ormelie, but on this occasion his vote against Reform was too recent to give him a hope of success; besides, from a strong sense of justice, the people were willing to give the Whigs a trial. Since that period eighteen months have elapsed, and such have been the blunders and backslidings of the pseudo patriots now in power—such their conduct in the case of the Dissenters—of the Irish Church and Irish Tithes—in the case of the Malt Tax—the House Tax—the Pension List—and above all in their disgracefully timid and imbecile Foreign Policy—that the people of England have wholly cast them off as unworthy of the great stewardship which they obtained under false pretences, and which they continue to hold more by reason of the favour of their enemies than by their own intrinsic strength.

It now only remains to us to speak of the personal appearance and oratorical manner of the new Member for Perthshire. Sir George Murray is of tall and graceful figure, and commanding carriage. His air is soldierly without being stiff. He has not the drif-sergeant bearing of one whose life has been chiefly spent in camps, but the ease and freedom of a well-bred gentleman. The hand of Time has thinned as well as silvered o'er his once flowing locks, but apart from this his

figure has all the erectness and some of the elasticity of youth. He is the best soldier-speaker we have ever had the good fortune to hear. There is nothing professional in his manner, in his action, or in his allusions. His voice is clear and mellifluous, and his action at once varied, graceful, and appropriate. He is evidently a person of sound and mature judgment, of great reflection, of much reading, and exquisite tact and taste. His sentences have all the point and polish of the accomplished rhetorician. It is recorded of the fortunate soldier, Cæsar, that he bore off the palm of eloquence from all his contemporaries, except Cicero; and he who said as much of our modern soldier would not be far from the truth. Sir George Murray was almost the only Scotchman in the House of Commons who spoke and pronounced the English language with propriety, and without the shadow of accent. Both the Grants, and the Lord Advocate, Mr. Jeffrey, are, no doubt, also exceptions in the present as in the last Parliament; but the education of the President of the Board of Control, and of the Judge-Advocate, has been wholly English, and Mr. Jeffrey graduated at Christ Church, Oxford. Nor is it the only praise of the Member for Perthshire to be imbued with a classic spirit and an elegant taste. He is moreover a person of considerable erudition, and has read ancient and modern history with a learned and liberal eye. Nor has reading dried up in him the soul of action; for he is a man of business in the best sense of the word. We remember to have heard him say, in the Session of 1830, that for many weeks previously, Lady Louisa had brought him his dinner, in her carriage, to the Colonial Office, pretty much for the same reason that bricklayers' labourers are served in the same fashion by their less elegant helpmates. In truth, Sir George had not leisure to return home, and rather than neglect the business of his office he would thus content himself with a hasty meal, snatched between the conclusion of the business of the office and the commencement of the orders of the day in the House of Commons. Against the diligence of the Ex-Colonial Secretary we have never heard a complaint. Unlike one of his countrymen now in power, he not only opened but answered all communications addressed to him; and unlike the present possessor of the Colonial Seals, he always returned a civil and polite answer to the humblest applicant.

It would be impertinent in us to speculate on what may be the conduct and course of proceedings of the new Member for Perthshire in the Reformed House, but we greatly err in our calculations if he will not be found among that intelligent and moderate party of politicians, who think that in state affairs *Non progredi est regredi*. Though an eloquent, a classical, and, it may be averred, a learned speaker, Sir George Murray cannot be called a debater, in the sense in which that word is applied to Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Stanley. He does not strain after the rotund and harmonious plausibility of the Right Hon. Baronet, still less does he seek to emulate the sinister dexterity—all for victory and not a whit for truth—of the present Secretary for the Colonies. But where there is no job to gloss over, and no fair cause to pervert—where truth is the object to be attained, and lucid exposition, and patient laborious examination, are among the means of acquiring and expounding the right and the just in political and moral science—the name of Sir George Murray must always be in the foremost rank of those rarely-gifted men, who are wise without pretension, learned without pedantry, and eloquent without verbosity.

## INEXPEDIENCY OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENTS TO EFFECT THEIR PROPOSED OBJECT.

THE efficacy of any punishment in deterring from crime, depends upon its *certainly of infliction*, far more than upon its *severity*. Almost every one shrinks from becoming accessory to the death of a fellow-creature on the scaffold, for any offence short of murder :—hence it is, that prosecutors, witnesses, and jurors, instead of rendering that assistance which is necessary to convict offenders, often endeavour to defeat the law, because of its sanguinary enactment. The *result* is *uncertainty* of punishment—encouraging the repetition of crime :

The following Table, compiled from Parliamentary Returns, will probably surprise those who imagine that severity is the only thing needful for the repression of crime :—

### LONDON AND MIDDLESEX.

CRIMES.	1st Period, 1827-28-29.		2d Period, 1830-31-32.	
	Executed.	Committed.	Executed.	Committed.
Burglary and housebreaking . . .	19	311	3	288
Coining . . . . .	4	18	none	12
Forgery . . . . .	8	50	none	61
Horse-stealing . . . . .	4	58	none	48
Stealing in a dwelling-house (to 5l.)	5	213	1	192
Sheep-stealing . . . . .	2	22	1	17
Total . . . . .	42	672	5	618

Here are six offences for which, in the first three years 42 persons were executed; in the latter only 5 ; and, together with the diminished frequency of executions, the number of commitments has fallen from 672 to 618, a diminution of 54. The only crime the number of *commitments* for which appears to have increased is forgery, and the increase is confined to London and Middlesex ; for it appears, on referring to the Criminal returns for England and Wales, which include those for London and Middlesex, that the number of commitments for this offence has fallen from 213 in the first three years, when 15 persons were executed, to 180 in the three following, when it ceased to be visited with the capital penalty.

It has been proved beyond a doubt that a *durable* punishment is more efficacious than a severe one. The execution of a criminal is a *momentary* infliction—it is soon forgotten, and then the example lost. Not so a living example of punishment :

Vindictive laws make vindictive subjects. But it is more especially in offenders themselves that the punishment of death produces a *savage* barbarity of disposition. It arises from this cause :—the dreadful fate with which they are threatened, hardens them to the sufferings of others. When it is considered that society becomes the victim of the inhumanity of criminals, this must be acknowledged to form a strong ar-

gument against capital enactments. The penalty of death, as an act of deliberate homicide, diminishes the regard due to the sanctity of life, and renders murder less revolting to the ignorant mind.

*Experience*—at various periods, and in different countries, is against the punishment of death. *Crime has flourished most under sanguinary laws*: The execution of a criminal makes—neither *restitution*, nor *satisfaction*: In hurrying him into eternity, it cuts off all hope of the malefactor's reformation.—“Dying as these unhappy wretches often do, who knows what their future lot may be!” It heaps unmerited suffering upon the relatives, and entails a lasting stigma upon orphans:

The spectacle it affords, *hardens and brutalizes* the bad, while it offends and disgusts the good.—If the criminal display a Christian penitence, the pity of the spectators is roused, and pity for the criminal is akin to hatred of the laws.—If he shew insensibility, it removes, instead of exciting, *terror*.—If he conduct himself with fortitude, the man, who, but a few moments before was detested for his crimes, is now admired and extolled for his heroism: Capital Punishment is prejudicial to the ends of justice, by removing a source of evidence. The testimony of a man who has been put to death, might have been valuable for the conviction of the guilty; or, what is infinitely more important, for the exculpation and acquittal of the innocent: It encourages one of the worst of all crimes—that *perjury which, by judicial process, robs a man of life*. Would the perjurer have dared to accuse, had his victim, instead of being hanged—been kept alive, ready, at any favourable opportunity, to prove his own innocence and to bring the author of his sufferings to justice?

Let it be borne in mind, that an *innocent* person is sometimes the victim—the fatal error not being discovered till it is *altogether irreparable*! When it is considered that all human tribunals are fallible, and that sometimes the evidence, particularly circumstantial evidence, is extremely slender, to say nothing of the dangerous tendency of offering *rewards for conviction*—is it surprising that many should have died upon the scaffold, innocent of the crimes imputed to them? In times of tyranny or civil commotion—and we know not how soon such times may occur—the punishment of death is liable to be perverted to the destruction, not only of innocent, but of valuable lives, to gratify political revenge, or serve the purposes of depraved ambition.

#### THE DUTY OF EVERY ONE TO AID IN THE PRESERVATION OF A FREE GOVERNMENT.

If we are bound to protect a neighbour, or even an enemy, from violence, to give him raiment when he is naked, or food when he is hungry, much more ought we to do our part toward the preservation of a free government; the only basis on which the enjoyment of these blessings can securely rest. He who breaks the fetters of slavery, and delivers a nation from thralldom, forms, in my opinion, the noblest comment on the great law of love, whilst he distributes the greatest blessing which man can receive from man; but next to that is the merit of him, who, in times like the present, watches over the edifice of public liberty, repairs its foundations, and strengthens its cement, when he beholds it hastening to decay.—*Robert Hall*.

## ADVANTAGEOUS EMPLOYMENT OF OUR SURPLUS POPULATION AT HOME.

---

WE are not among the number of those who believe that this kingdom has yet attained to the full extent of the population it might abundantly employ and happily support, for we think the evil under which we labour is not the impossibility of finding profitable employment and sufficient food, raiment, and shelter for every human being in the land, but a mal-distribution of the wealth which exists, and which, because it is heaped up in too large masses in the hands of the over-gorged few, is therefore very scantily spread over the larger surface occupied by the destitute many. Be that, however, as it may, it is clear that there is great practical distress among the labouring population, and that chiefly from their being either unable to obtain employment, or for which, if they do obtain it, they are but wretchedly paid. We do not in this instance allude to the Trades' Unions and their strikes, for some of these seem wholly unjustified by immediate distress; but rather of the condition of the agricultural labourers, the hand-loom weavers, and some others, whose wants are most urgent, and who can scarcely obtain a bare subsistence by incessant toil.

For the relief of this large class of sufferers, it is essential that new modes should be devised by which manual labour should be called into large demand. And this we think has been most successfully done by the proposed plans of Mr. Ward, suggested by the improvements introduced by Mr. Snowden, who has proved, by theory and practice, that his plans, if adopted, would lead to the substitution of manual labour for horses on ordinary roads, and steam-power on railways; thereby saving the food now consumed by the vast number of draught animals employed, as well as giving profitable occupation to men, by which employment might at once be given to every industrious labourer in the kingdom.

Mr. Snowden's improvements consisted chiefly in this, the discovery of a mode by which railways could be formed, on every road in the kingdom, without the vast expense of cutting down hills, or filling up valleys to produce an actual level, but that such railroads could be constructed on the unequal surfaces that now exist; and the locomotive engines be moved by horses or steam power as at present. Mr. Ward's improvement on Mr. Snowden's plan consists in showing that manual labour may be substituted on such roads for horses or steam, and consequently a wide field opened for the employment of large masses of the population, and that too, in a manner healthy and advantageous to themselves, and cheaper to the community than the agencies they are intended to supersede. We deem this a discovery of so much importance at the present moment that we shall make no apology for transcribing Mr. Ward's own account of the manner in which his im-

provements on Mr. Snowden's inventions suggested themselves to his mind, and the reasoning by which he follows out the application :—

“ Upon minutely examining Mr. Snowden's very valuable invention, it immediately occurred to me that by an alteration of some portion of the application of the machinery, the carriage could be efficiently worked by manual labour, which, if capable of being achieved, would be an object of the very highest importance to the community; and it is with heartfelt satisfaction, that I feel myself fully justified in asserting that my efforts have been completely successful; indeed, I have most happily arrived at a point of advantage in favour of manual labour, which my most sanguine expectations had not ventured to anticipate; namely, the means of using manual labour, so as to produce a most extraordinary diminution of the expense that must be incurred by the use of steam power, whilst equal velocity and inefficiency is secured, without any possibility of risk or danger. It follows that the general adoption of this new system for the conveyance of goods and passengers, will at once terminate *the fallacy of a redundant population*, by supplying beneficial employment to millions of our fellow-creatures; and will practically prove the gross error of the modern school of political economy, which would represent *increase of population* as a national evil, whereas, it is in reality the source of all its wealth and strength. The truth appears to be, that the modern political economist founds his speculations and calculations upon the false basis of deeming the then existing state of society as permanent; it is, however, certain that society is constantly undergoing a change, and as constantly adapting itself to the alterations which take place; for as no limit can be placed to the increase of knowledge, neither can the inventive faculties of man be otherwise circumscribed, than by the extent of his acquirement of knowledge, which is the parent of discovery and the source of all improvements; and hence it is that machinery and steam power have, for a time, displaced the labour of man, but the accession of knowledge will infallibly replace man's labour, to be otherwise employed more advantageously, and to the greater advancement of the public good.

The *Foreign Quarterly Review* of October, 1832, has the following quotation on this subject :— “ If we shall succeed in displacing horses, by the very machinery that formerly displaced men, and thus remedy by machinery a few of the evils of which it has been the cause, if by diminishing the consumption of corn, we take one penny from the price of the poor man's loaf, or one pang from the ills of his lot, we shall attain a high and noble end, an end worthy of a Newton's genius, and a nation's boast.” And on the same subject Alexander Gordon, Esq., says, “ Although the use of the steam-engine has cheapened every other necessary of life, it has not lessened the price of food. Although it has reduced the value of the poor man's labour (his only valuable commodity), it has not reduced the price of that for which he must labour.”

When, therefore, it is fully understood that Mr. Snowden's inventions can be so adapted as to secure employment for man, without, however, in any manner lessening the public benefit, *but as the very cheapest power which can be applied*; then will the merits of his inventions and their new adaptation receive the due meed of praise, and his

countrymen whilst enriched and enriching themselves through the medium of his inventions, will feel the gratification of knowing, that they are also ministering to the great cause of humanity ; that they are securing certain permanent and beneficial employment to the industrious labourer, and raising him from the degradation of pauperism to independence, and to a respectable station in the scale of society.

The great desideratum unsuccessfully sought by the public, and hitherto in vain endeavoured to be achieved by scientific men, namely, to obviate the enormous expense unavoidably incurred for securing the level requisite to be maintained for propelling carriages upon railways—this very important object has now been most happily surmounted by Mr. Snowden's inventions, distinguished alike as they are for efficiency and simplicity, and combining the peculiar advantages of safety, strength, and extreme cheapness.

The first portion of Mr. Snowden's invention consists of two rails resting upon suitable bearings, either on the ground, below the surface in excavations, or raised upon standards, in conformity to the natural undulations of the ground to be passed over ; consequently, in laying Mr. Snowden's railway, no wasteful expenditure is incurred for cutting down hills or filling up hollow ground to the required level, but merely continuing the viaduct or hollow rack-rail at an outlay in itself inconsiderable, especially when compared to the immense sums unavoidably expended in the construction of all railways known, or now in use. The railway is formed of two side rails, properly braced together, which support a rail of three inches in breadth, and in some situations a platform at top, on which the propelling carriage, and carriages to be propelled, travel, with common wheels, *and without flanges*. On a spindle, attached to each axle of the carriage, is a revolving wheel, loosely placed in a horizontal position, for the purpose of steadying the motion, and preventing the possibility of the carriage being driven off the rail. In one of the upright side-rails is formed a grooved rack, which is acted upon by a toothed or cogged wheel, moving also horizontally ; to which motion can be equally given by steam or manual power, either force applied to the spindle gives the propelling motion along the railway, by rapidly turning the cogged wheel ; manual power, however, will be found equally effective, and much cheaper than steam. The mechanism by which power of motion is given to Mr. Snowden's railway, is after the same manner in which weighty goods are raised and lowered perpendicularly by the use of the ordinary crane ; the only distinction consists in the propelling motion being here used horizontally, whereas the raising motion is perpendicular, but the principle is the same in each, although differently applied. By this railway two important advantages are obtained : first, the smoother the surface of the upper rail, the greater will be the facility for the running wheels ; and, secondly, in gaining the purchase by means of the grooved or racked rail and the horizontal cogged wheel, the power, if given by manual labour, can at all times be regulated and apportioned to the exact force required ; or in proportion to the weight of goods or number of passengers to be conveyed, thereby greatly lessening the general annual expenditure. By this invention only one wheel is required to be set in action by the propelling power, thereby securing uniformity of motion to the carriages, whilst it is equal to any strain or weight of



draught which can possibly have to be moved forwards (that draught being on a level only 6lbs. per ton), and is constantly kept to the pitch-line by the revolving wheels or rollers.

The great national advantages to be obtained by Mr. Snowden's inventions, and their vast superiority over all others hitherto discovered, may be comprised under the following heads, viz. :

The expense of the railway is reduced to little more than the cost of the iron; and the first cost of the propelling carriage, instead of being 1000*l.*, as is the case when steam is used, would not exceed 100*l.*, and the wear and tear be comparatively trifling. These alone would give his inventions a substantial claim to public support, facilitating as they do in a most extraordinary degree the general extension and use of railroads throughout the country; and when viewed with reference to the employment of manual labour, their value surpasses all calculation; they then diminish the first cost of vehicles to be used on the railway to a mere trifle; they do away altogether with the expense of fuel and the inconvenience of smoke; explosion and danger are rendered impossible; and the unemployed labourer is supplied with an inexhaustible source of *remuncrating employment*, not solely on the score of humanity, but because it will be found both the cheapest and the best.

Here it may be proper to advert to the general prejudice that exists against the use of a rack-rail and cogged wheel; this may be readily traced to the circumstance of the rack-rail and cogged wheel having been the principle adopted in the construction of the first locomotive engines introduced into the coal districts of the North of England. In practice they were found to be exceedingly faulty; but why were they so? It arose from their defective and unscientific construction, from the misapplication of machinery, which, if properly applied, would have produced the very best results. The fact is, that the perfect principle of the crane for raising weights perpendicularly was most strangely made use of to produce a propelling and horizontal motion; and then every defect discovered as appertaining to misapplied machinery was at once attributed to, and held to be inherent disabilities arising entirely and exclusively from the rack-rail and cogged wheel. Prejudice, however, ought not to be allowed any importance in matters of science; and although to the improper adaptation of the perpendicular position, was added the constant friction of the superincumbent weight of the machine itself; with all these disadvantages, the surprise is that these locomotive engines were capable of performing the work they did—not that they were so little perfect. The horizontal wheel will be found to obviate every objection, and its use will ultimately become universal, whatever check it may receive at the outset, either from prejudice or any other cause. Nothing but the misapplication here alluded to could possibly give rise to such a determined prejudice against a cog-wheel and rack being applied to railway purposes; for in all descriptions of machinery, either in *very fast or in very slow motions, heavy or light work*, they are, when scientifically and properly applied, found more efficient and perfect than any method yet discovered.

¶ It is well known that much attention has been bestowed, and vast sums expended, in endeavouring to substitute inanimate for any other

power of conveyance; but hitherto no one has contemplated the immeasurable advantages which would ensue, by displacing horses from the conveyance of goods and passengers, and substituting in their place manual labour; yet this truly desirable object is now fully capable of being accomplished, and only requires to be duly aided by patriotic and influential parties, desirous of conferring so great a boon upon their suffering countrymen, and ensuring abundant employment for the industrious classes, and "opening up to more distant parts of the empire the sources of wealth and industry;" whilst it will effectually abolish the many cruelties that are at present inflicted on that noble animal the horse, particularly those connected with overdriving, to keep time in our mail and stage coaches.

It is a received opinion that steam power cannot be used economically in preference to horses, when the rate of travelling is less than four miles an hour; and it is an indisputable fact, that horses employed as they now are in stage-coach travelling, are unable to compete with steam power, either profitably or in point of speed; and this arises from the circumstance of the animal being forced to do his work in so short a period of time as soon to ruin his constitution; permit the horse, however, to proceed at an easy pace, and he will work eight or nine hours per day without the least injury to himself, live three times as long, if well treated, and yield ample profit to his owner.

The result of every examination of the subject, hitherto, has been a decided opinion, that steam power must be necessarily more economical than horse power, where velocity is required; now the truth is, that by an easy adaptation of animal power, it far excels steam power in economy, and is quite equal to it in speed. Nor is this circumstance so extraordinary as at first sight it may appear; for it has been admitted that horses can work cheaper than steam locomotion, when travelling at or under four miles an hour: an admission which is decisive of the position now advanced. In both instances, of the horse or locomotive engine, it is the rapid travelling that causes the great expense: in the case of the animal, he is soon destroyed; and in practice we find the wear and tear is exceedingly great of a ponderous and a very complicated machine, weighing from seven to ten tons, and travelling occasionally at a speed of twenty-five miles an hour, frequently rendering the engine out of repair, and consequently in its use entailing very heavy expenses. To obviate these difficulties, the inventor of the improved railway and carriage, has arranged the machinery in so effective a manner, that if propelled by manual labour, the men employed would perform their work whilst sitting, although the rate of travelling by the carriage would be twenty miles an hour; when the carriage need only be one-tenth of the weight of those now used, and the machinery being so extremely simple, the wear and tear would be reduced in proportion, as well on the carriage as upon the rail; and it is certain that, with reference to economy in slow motion, as well as quick travelling, Mr. Snowden's invention will be found to merit the same preference.

Independent of the incalculable advantage contemplated by the introduction of Mr. Snowden's invention of railway and carriage, in dispensing with the necessity of levelling the country, together with its importance in giving immediate employment to man, instead of horse or steam power; it is capable of being satisfactorily shown, that far

travelling can be attained much more economically by manual labour, under every view of the question, than by steam locomotion, and hence the great object sought after is now attained—that of securing employment for the many individuals seeking for work, but looking for it in vain.

It is proposed that the carriage shall be so constructed, that for every three tons gross weight, two tons shall be merchandise, and one ton shall comprise both carriage and machinery, which are simple in an extraordinary degree: for such gross weight four men are allowed, whose united strength in turning a winch or lever is estimated at 144 lbs., placing them in the best position for exerting their power with the greatest ease to themselves; this force will be more than sufficient to propel three tons on this railway at twenty miles an hour, for what may be termed a working day of eight hours; which will average one hundred and sixty miles, and at a cost for labour, varying, according to situation, from 6s. to 12s., being from one farthing to one halfpenny per ton per mile according to locality.

In displacing the horses employed for public conveyances, we arrive at an accession of grain or food for eight millions of human beings, and at the same time producing extra employment for five millions of our countrymen. It is well remarked by the *Courier*, on Locomotion, that “Our coal and iron are far more valuable than gold or diamonds; they are the ready means of putting in motion all the gigantic operations of our almost superhuman machinery; nothing is wanting but the means of giving life and impulse, to the stagnant industry of the country.”

Colonel Torrens, in his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons says:—

“So that even upon the extreme and most improbable supposition, that steam-carriages should never be employed in conveying agricultural produce to market at a cheaper rate, still the benefit to the country would be very great, in as much that we should have a vastly increased industrious population, and England would become much more extensively than she is at present, the great workshop of the world. In point of fact, superseding horses by mechanical power, would have precisely the same effect in increasing the population and wealth of England, as would be produced were we to increase the extent of the country, by adding thereto a new and fertile territory, equal in extent to all the land which now breeds and feeds all the horses employed upon common roads; such addition to the extent of fertile territory in England suddenly effected, would, in the first instance, lower the value of agricultural produce, and be injurious to the proprietors of the old portion of the territory; but no person would therefore contend, that if we could enlarge the Island of Great Britain by additional tracts of fertile land, the public interests would be injured by such enlargement; this would be monstrously absurd. It is not less absurd to object to the increase of food available for human beings, by substituting mechanical power for horses.”

“I think it not unfair to conclude, that were elementary power on the common roads completely to supersede draught-horses, the population, wealth, and power of Great Britain would be at least doubled.”

In accordance with these enlightened sentiments, it may be fairly assumed that Mr. Snowden's carriage and railway *recommend themselves in a peculiar degree to the best feelings of our nature*, by securing constant and ample employ for the population of the country; creating a most important saving to the public, and bringing benefits home to every individual in the community; forming at once a new era

in the trade, commerce, manufactures, and industry of the nation; whilst they will for ever preclude the approach of want to the willing labourer and ensure him reasonable comforts; for the impossibility of procuring employment by the labouring poor produces crime, misery, and want. Henceforward Mr. Snowden's inventions will supply adequate labour, and ensure fair remuneration for the toil of man; the great panacea of public employment and national wealth, is here submitted for adoption, and it were a crime to permit it to lay dormant.

It is the duty of the Government to foster and encourage the means of ensuring employment for the people—a paramount duty of far more importance than any other connected with the management of our public affairs; inasmuch as labour is the only element of national wealth; and ample remunerative employment, is the surest means of promoting public morals, and ensuring general prosperity. Ireland may now be supplied with beneficial employ for its starving inhabitants, and internal peace and comfort conferred upon that distracted country. Scotland may be still further improved, and its meritorious people enriched and benefited, by aiding their proverbial industry; and England be again made happy Old England, with its manufactures and arts once more flourishing, and placed upon the surest basis of future greatness, by its people's labour, their industry, their enterprise, and their unrivalled skill."

Several tabular statements are then given, to show the vast advantage, in point of economy, of manual labour over steam, on the roads proposed—the data being taken from the actual expense of the existing steam railways: after which the following extract is given from Colonel Torrens's evidence before the House of Commons:

"This cheaper mode of internal carriage will not only lower the price of light and refined manufactures to the home consumer, but will lower their price also to the foreign consumer. This will increase the advantages which we at present in the foreign market, and tend to increase our foreign commerce. So that here again there will be an increased demand for manufactures and a manufacturing population, and here again will be another beneficial reaction upon the soil. So that the more we contemplate the various effects produced upon the industry of the country, by a cheaper mode of conveyance, the more we must be convinced that wealth and population will be increased, and that agriculture, instead of being injured, must necessarily partake in the increased prosperity of the country. In addition to what I have already stated, the saving of expense and of time in conveying passengers and goods, and the rapidity of communication, will produce effects, the amount of which it would be almost impossible to calculate."—From Colonel Torrens's evidence before the House of Commons.

It is too generally contended, without duly considering the enormous expense thereby incurred, that cutting down hills and filling up valleys is the *only* method of constructing railways with advantage to the capitalist; some writers, treating on railways, have gone so far as to assert, that the moment a hill of even very trifling ascent is to be overcome, all advantages of a railway over that of a common road from that time ceases. Nothing can be more erroneous; it is, in fact, assuming the impossibility of propelling carriages with their merchandise up the inclined plane. It being proved that it is possible to propel the carriages up an inclined plane 1 foot in 12, it may be asked, whether the labour expended in cutting down the hills and filling up the valleys, would not be more profitably employed in the conveyance of passengers and goods? It is certain that all labour un-

profitably employed is a waste of money which *never* can be recovered ; in the construction of the London and Birmingham Railroad five years probably will elapse ere any returns are made, and the outlay labour exceeding 1,500,000*l.* (independent of other charges incidental to the levelling system) ; the interest on such outlay for labour at 5 per cent. is 75,000*l.*, an annual charge upon the undertaking, amounting to more than would be required by Mr. Snowden's plans, for the supply of the labour or motive force *by man*, for the transit of all the traffic over hill and dale, at a velocity averaging twenty miles an hour. Passengers being charged 1*d.* per mile each, and goods at about 5 farthings per ton per mile, when the Liverpool and Manchester charge is 5*s.* or 2*d.* per mile for passengers, and 7*s.* or about 2½*d.* per ton per mile for goods. Mr. Ward concludes by saying,

"I feel that in bringing this most important subject before the public, I am only performing an imperious duty, and having done my part it remains for the Government to do theirs also ; by giving every facility and the utmost encouragement to the extension and general use of a means, which will so largely promote the trade, manufactures, and commerce of the country ; and which above all will carry content and comfort to every fireside. In the same feeling I also call for the best aid of every patriotic and influential individual in the empire, and more particularly upon the Landed Proprietary, to give their undivided assistance in advancing by this means the well-being of society. But let me be rightly understood : I require neither of the Government, nor of any individual to be satisfied with the averments of Mr. Snowden, the inventor, or with the statements made by myself, as the commentator upon his inventions. What we require is, that a fair trial shall be made, when Mr. Snowden will be able to demonstrate the great superiority as to efficiency and cheapness of his railway, and I shall be enabled to prove the still greater cheapness, safety, and perfect efficiency of my substitution of manual labour for steam power ; and that by its general introduction there shall no longer be pretence for saying there exists a redundant population ; neither will any willing labourer be afterwards driven to participate the pauper's mess, for want of remunerative employ ; but on the contrary, the whole body of society will receive a new and vigorous impulse, that cannot fail to diffuse health and happiness to all. Mr. Snowden and myself are solicitous to submit the merits of the inventions to such an impartial test, as may be conclusive : and if I shall be the humble instrument of rendering so essential a good to my country, it will be my proudest boast, and my ample reward.

Individuals, interested in this valuable discovery, will be afforded the fullest opportunity of judging of its merits, by inspecting, at 319, OXFORD STREET, on Mondays and Thursdays, a few yards of railway and a carriage, on which they may propel themselves, proving with how little exertion it can be effected."

"We cannot express too strongly our sense of the importance of this discovery : and we advise such of our readers as have influence enough to draw the attention of the Government, or of capitalists, to the subject, to do so without delay ; as no greater benefit could be conferred on the country at the present moment, than finding healthy and useful employment for the vast numbers of our labouring population, who are at present suffering so severely from the want of steady and remunerating occupation.

## MR. TENNYSON'S MOTION FOR SHORTENING THE DURATION OF PARLIAMENTS.

THE principal discussion that has taken place since our last, is that which occurred on Thursday, the 15th instant, on the motion of Mr. Tennyson, for leave to bring in a Bill to shorten the duration of Parliaments—a Bill, in which the term to which future Parliaments were to be restricted, was to be left blank, and filled up in Committee; by the word six—or five—or four—or three, as the majority might determine—the Bill merely enunciating the principle, that *seven* years was too long a period, and that, therefore, the Septennial Act ought to be repealed. As it was a Drawing-room day, which would permit excuse to many Members for being absent; and as it was known that the Ministers desired to have the House counted out, if possible, so as to get rid of the debate altogether, great fears were entertained that this result would happen; and at one period of the evening, between seven and eight o'clock, the benches were very thin, and not more than fifty or sixty Members were present. But, finding the counting out impossible, from the number of friends who, apprehending this, took care to be present and prevent it, the House began to fill rapidly after nine o'clock; and by ten, there were upwards of 400 members assembled to strengthen the hands of Ministers in their opposition to the measure.

The discussion was opened by Mr. Tennyson, somewhat feebly at first, but with more energy as he proceeded. He treated with great ability all the historical part of the question. He showed, also, that in past times, the whole of the present Administration were advocates for the repeal of the Septennial Act, and the return to triennial Parliaments; and he argued that since the passing of the Reform Bill, the constituency had become so much more extensive, intelligent, and popular, that it was more than ever necessary to give them frequent opportunities of correcting their choice. Sir Edward Codrington seconded the motion of Mr. Tennyson for leave to bring in a Bill to shorten the duration of Parliaments, though he should vote in Committee for filling up the blank with five years instead of three.

Colonel Davies argued against the measure, on the ground that it was premature and injudicious, and that it would subvert the independence of Parliament; that it would introduce too many new Members, ignorant of the forms of the House, and unacquainted with the business of legislation; that it would obstruct public business, and occasion great expense, excitement, and immorality, by too frequent elections. He thought the Reform Bill ought to have a fair trial, and that the present Parliaments, taken on the average, were not longer than was beneficial to all parties.

Lord Dalmeny made an excellent speech, as far as good language,  
VOL. I.—SESSION OF 1834. 3 c

agreeable utterance, and accurate composition could make it so: but its principal if not only argument against the measure was, that it would make Members mere delegates of their constituents, and make popular clamour usurp the place of calm and sober judgment.

Mr. Buckingham replied, at length, to the arguments of Colonel Davies, and Lord Dalmeny, and supported Mr. Tennyson's Motion. Mr. Ewart, Sir Daniel Sandford, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. James, Mr. W. Roche, Colonel Evans, Mr. Sheil, Mr. Hall, Mr. E. L. Bulwer, and Sir W. Chaytor, all supported the Motion. And Lord Althorp, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Stanley, Lord Ebrington, and Lord John Russell opposed it. Mr. James supported the motion for bringing in the Bill; but said that, instead of filling up the blank with any particular number of years, he should move, in Committee, that every year, one-third of the whole House should go out, and that the portion so to be removed should be determined by ballot: while Mr. E. J. Stanley moved, as an amendment, that the Bill should at once fix five years as the maximum duration of the Parliament; but on this no division took place.

We had intended to have written an article on this subject, as well as to have given a fuller account of the debate; but our space is so circumscribed, that we cannot do both; and as our views are expressed at moderate length in the speech delivered in the course of the debate, we take it as reported in the *Mirror of Parliament*, and substitute it for the article which would but have contained the sentiments clothed in other words. The speech is reported as follows:

MR. BUCKINGHAM—Sir, I can venture to promise the House that I shall be very short, and confine myself strictly to the arguments of the case. The question now before the House resolves itself into two branches—the one, the historical—the other, the practical. It is to the latter that I shall principally address myself, the former having been already so amply treated by the right hon. gentleman who introduced the motion. The strongest objections to the practical utility of the measure proposed have been carefully collected and skilfully put by the hon. and gallant member for Worcester (Colonel Davies), but they are not, I think, very difficult to answer. The gallant officer began by saying that the motion of the right hon. gentleman was premature—injudicious—and if carried into effect, would tend to subvert the independence of Parliament. Now it is matter of history that the friends of liberty in England have been pressing for this measure for the last half century at least; so that it is not new; and it is difficult to understand how that which was urged with so much force, though with so little effect fifty years ago, can be considered premature. It may, in the estimation of some, be injudicious; that is purely matter of opinion. But the assertion, that if carried, it would tend to subvert the independence of Parliament, is certainly one of the most remarkable that has been made in this House for some time past. The independence of Parliament! Independent of what? That the House of Commons should be independent of the Sovereign, is undoubtedly a most constitutional doctrine; that it should be independent of the House of Peers is equally constitutional. But to say that it should be independent of the people, is a doctrine calculated to subvert all our notions of representative government. (Hear, hear.) If the House of Commons were once to render itself independent of the people, there would be no need of fixing any limits whatever to the duration of Parliaments. They might continue till the majority decreed a dissolution, which would never take place, and representatives would then be able to do without constituents at all, as was the case under the old nominee system, which the Reform Bill was introduced to destroy. It is not desirable, therefore, that Parliament should be independent of the people; or, if it be, the sooner that independence is subverted by frequent elections the better. (Hear, hear.)

The gallant member, in enumerating the evils that would spring from too frequent elections, said he thought three and even five years too short a period; and added, that such elections would introduce into the House a number of new members, who, for some time, would have their efficiency greatly impaired by not being acquainted with the forms of the House, and by being new to the business of legislation. As to the first, no doubt this would sometimes happen; it had indeed taken place only a few evenings ago, when, on the discussion of the first clause in the Poor Law Amendment Bill, a very small minority, of whom I am not ashamed to remember that I was one, wished to have further time given to the country for considering the nature of the measure, and proposed to divide the House for the purpose of securing an adjournment of the debate, but the exact form in which the motion should be put for the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. Bernal), to report progress and sit again, was not known to any of the small group, who were all new members, nor did the older ones appear at all disposed to assist them. But this is a species of knowledge which might be acquired in a few days, if some hon. gentleman, learned in precedents, and thoroughly acquainted with the forms of the House, would compile a short manual, containing all the requisite information on those heads, than which no more acceptable service could be rendered to the members generally.

It has been said, indeed, that the great additions of new members to the House had obstructed the progress of public business, from their want of acquaintance with the forms of the House, and the difficulty of managing them by the leader. But, the reproach of obstructing the progress of the public business in the last session of Parliament is not so applicable to the new members as to the old ones; for in an analysis that was made of the number of speeches uttered by the different members, and the aggregate number of hours occupied in their delivery, as published in that clever paper, the *Spectator*, it was shown that the old members were the greatest offenders in these particulars throughout the whole session, while in the early part of it, the unpopular measure of the Irish Coercion Bill was itself a great cause of much of the difficulty and delay complained of. (Hear, hear.)

- As to the second objection, that frequent elections would introduce into Parliament men new to the business of legislation, it should be remembered that gentlemen are not chosen to be placed in the House, as at a college, there to study for the first time the science of politics and government. On the contrary, it is almost invariably the case, that men are chosen because they have previously bestowed some attention on the study of public affairs, and are able to give a satisfactory account of their principles, and the reasons on which they are grounded, to the constituency whose suffrages place them in Parliament; so that they have not to learn, for the first time, on taking their seat, the facts and arguments bearing on the questions on which they will have to decide; for, having investigated them and expounded their views upon them before they came into the House, they would be equally able to take a part in the discussion afterwards, whenever called upon so to do. (Hear.)

The hon. gentleman, however, asked why sufficient time had not been given to allow the Reform Bill a fair trial, and contended that thus far at least it had worked well; by which, if he means any thing, he must mean that the present House of Commons fairly represents the people of England—a position to which I should venture to take exception. I am aware that it would be a much more agreeable task for me to flatter than to reprove. I do not desire to do either, but merely to speak the truth; and thus acting, I must say that if my memory does not wholly deceive me, I think I could call to mind many instances in which the votes of hon. members after they had entered the House did not strictly conform to the pledges which they gave before they were elected. I do not pretend to say in which case they were right or in which they were wrong; but I must be allowed to doubt whether they could truly represent their constituents in both cases; since there is pretty strong evidence of the opinions of the people being nearly the same as they were two years ago; though the opinions of many of their representatives, judging at least from their votes, have undergone great and material change. (Hear, hear, hear.)

The great expense, the drudgery of frequent canvassing, and the excitement



and demoralization of the country by frequent elections, have been also urged by the hon. and gallant member as reasons against shortening the duration of Parliament. But it is surely no *necessary* part of an election that there should be either expense, or drudgery, or demoralization. In this respect the new constituencies have set an example which may well shame the old ones into imitation. It is not very agreeable to speak of one's self, but as I am better acquainted with the facts attending my own election than those of any other, I may mention, for the honour of the borough which I have the satisfaction to represent, that though it contains nearly 100,000 inhabitants, I never canvassed a single individual, nor solicited a single person for his vote; nor did the election cost me a single shilling of expense. I publicly avowed, indeed, my disapprobation of the practice of a Member canvassing for votes in his own person. I always held that he should be solicited by the electors, and chosen for his qualifications and fitness only; and that they should bear the charge; since it was their business, and not his own, that he was called upon to perform. (Hear, hear.) It is true, that owing to the present badly arranged system of elections, much excitement does prevail during the short period that it lasts; but this is no necessary part of the affair. My conviction is, however, that it is the very infrequency of their return which chiefly causes the excitement, and that if they were of more common occurrence they would be less marked and less observed. But it would be perfectly easy so to arrange the mode of conducting an election of a Member of Parliament as to cause it to create no more excitement or confusion than the election of an East India or Bank Director. For my own part indeed, I know not why there should be *any* fixed period whatever for the duration of a member's services, or for his responsibility to his constituents. When men choose their physician, or solicitor, or agent, to whom they intrust their health, their fortunes, and their business, they do not engage them for seven years or five, for three years or even one, but continue them in office so long as they discharge their duties faithfully, and when they cease to do this they are justly removed to give place to others. I believe this would be the best footing on which to place a representative. I can see no safe halting place myself, between complete irresponsibility by holding the seat as the peers do, for life, being accountable therefore to no one—and perfect responsibility, by being liable at any hour to be called upon: by those whose votes have placed us in Parliament, to resign our trust whenever we fail to perform our duty. I may add, however, that I neither regard a member to be a *mere* delegate, having no will of his own, nor a perfectly free agent, under no obligation to consult his constituents at all. I feel that his position should be between these two extremes. He is bound on all occasions to state frankly to the electors his own general views, and if these are satisfactory, he cannot be unfaithful by following them out. If, however, on questions of great import, his views run counter to theirs, they are bound in justice to themselves to correct their error by recalling their representative, and sending some one to fill his place more nearly resembling themselves. Besides this being their duty to recall their member, I think it is his duty not to wait for such a summons, but to make a voluntary surrender of his trust; and for my own part, I cannot understand how any man of a nice sense of honour would condescend to sit for any place a moment longer than while he felt that he was the true representative of the wishes of its inhabitants, not in name only, but in reality and truth. (Hear, hear.) That at least is the footing on which I have the proud satisfaction of feeling that I stand with my own constituents, and it is because of this constant impression of my accountability to them for every vote I give, that I feel no period to be too short, and no meetings of them too frequent; so that as far as is compatible with a reasonable confidence on the one hand, and a reasonable trial on the other, I should be as willing to vote for an annual as for a triennial Parliament; on the principle that he who faithfully performs his duty need never be ashamed or afraid to meet his constituents and friends. (Cheers.)

The noble lord opposite (Lord Dalmeny), had spoken with great eloquence on the subject, but while I bear my willing testimony to the talent displayed in his speech, I am bound to state that his arguments made but very slight impression on my mind. The chief argument of the noble lord against shortening

the duration of Parliaments was this, that it would subject the representatives of the people too frequently to the influence of the whim and caprice of the multitude, and make them too often the mere instruments of popular clamour. This argument, however, appears to me much more plausible than just. If the people are really competent to form a judgment on political affairs, I cannot perceive why they may not be trusted to do this frequently as to do it only on rare occasions. The oftener their judgments are exercised, the more they will be likely to be sound. And there seems no reason to suppose that electors would be carried away by clamour because they had to give their votes once in three years, any more than that members should lose their reason because they are called upon to vote almost every night. But it would be well if hon. gentlemen using this danger of popular clamour as an argument, would define clearly what they meant by the phrase. To me it appears that popular clamour and public opinion are convertible terms; and each is used, not according to any rule for testing the one or the other, but according to the wishes of the party using it. If, for instance, the voice of the multitude is raised strongly in favour of any measure of which the speaker approves, and this voice is expressed with ever so much force or strength, as in the case of the Reform Bill, it is then called "enlightened public opinion," and is triumphantly referred to as proof of the absolute necessity of deferring to that opinion and adopting the measure proposed. If, on the contrary, the voice of the multitude is raised strongly against any measure of which the speaker approves, such, for instance, as the Poor Law Amendment Bill, then, as if by the wand of the magician, this "enlightened public opinion" is instantly transformed into "vulgar and unmeaning clamour," though it is the same public who speaks—the same meetings that assemble—the same judgments that resolve—the same press that gives publicity, in both cases. When the popular gale blows in favour of the orator's views, it is then *Vox populi, vox Dei*, and it is bowed down to, in a homage both ardent and sincere; but when the gale is adverse, the scene becomes entirely changed; and all the veneration before expressed for public intelligence and public virtue, is turned to hatred, scorn, and contempt. (Loud cheers.)

Sir, I would seek for no other explanation of our duties than that which is conveyed in the very term by which we are designated. We are sent here as the representatives of the people. How can we possibly represent them, without respecting and giving expression to their will? It is not practicable, I admit, for a member to consult his constituents on every question, that is discussed during a single session, and many cases may arise, in which, during its progress, he may feel justified in acting according to the best of his own judgment, even should he feel that to be in opposition to the views of many who form his constituency; such for instance, as cases where new evidence as to facts, or new views in argument, have been presented to his mind since they last met, or where his own opinions may have undergone a change through more mature reflection. Such cases, however, will form the exceptions rather than the rule; and it is because a member is chosen for his well known sentiments on the great principles of public policy, that he may be safely trusted to act as he thinks proper for a season. But this, of course, must imply some period of accountability, so as to give his constituents an opportunity of correcting their choice if they see fit. And surely it cannot be denied, that to make this accountability of any effect, it ought to be frequent; if so, then seven years must be deemed much too long; five appears to me only somewhat less objectionable; three, I think, would be quite long enough; and for my own part, I should as readily submit to one as to any longer number: my feeling being this: that if, on any occasion, I may have voted contrary to the generally prevalent opinion of my friends, I must have done so on grounds which justified me to my own mind in dissenting from their views; and that the same arguments which convinced me, would be likely to convince them also; and if not, I should feel far more pleasure in resigning my trust because the conscientious discharge of my duty led to its forfeiture, than I should consider myself honoured by being continued in my seat by the mere duration of Parliament, after I had ceased truly to represent the wishes of the majority of those whose votes originally placed me there. (Hear, hear, hear.)

I shall, therefore, Sir, with all sincerity, give my most cordial support to the motion of the right. hon. member for Lambeth.

At the close of the debate, Mr. Tennyson made a short reply; and on the division being called for, the numbers were. For the Motion 185; Against it 235; the Motion being, therefore, negatived by a Majority of 50. It is worthy of remark that the majority on the same question last year, was about the same as the present, namely, 49; and on both occasions, the Ministers were indebted to the Tories for the victory they obtained. It was the same on the Pension List, and on every other constitutional question. The Tories, therefore, form at present, the balance of power in the House, and may turn the scale against the Ministers, on any day, whenever they may choose to vote with the Liberals—and such a crisis does not seem very remote.

#### “NET WEALTH IN COMMODITIES TAKEN FROM INDUSTRY.

The amounts of wealth, expressed in commodities, which were taken from the producers in each of the years 1792, 1813, and 1831, may be estimated and exhibited by taking the sums paid by them, in currency, in each of those years, and ascertaining the quantities of wheat, as the representative of commodities, which those sums would command at the currency prices of the times. Thus,

	Net wealth.	When wheat was at	Qrs. of wheat.
In 1792	40,000,000 <i>l.</i>	55 <i>s</i> per qr. equalled	14,545,454
In 1813	155,000,000 <i>l.</i>	120 <i>s</i> per qr. equalled	25,833,333
In 1831	90,000,000 <i>l.</i>	66 <i>s</i> per qr. equalled	27,272,727
Or, if	100,000,000 <i>l.</i>	66 <i>s</i> per qr. equalled	30,308,030

The proportions of these taken by government and by individuals were,

In 1792	by government,	18,000,000 <i>l.</i>	equal to	6,545,454 qrs.*
	by individuals,	22,000,000 <i>l.</i>	equal to	8,000,000 qrs.
In 1813	by government,	109,000,000 <i>l.</i>	equal to	18,166,666 qrs.
	by individuals,	46,000,000 <i>l.</i>	equal to	7,666,666 qrs.
In 1831	by government,	46,000,000 <i>l.</i>	equal to	13,939,393 qrs.
	by individuals,	44,000,000 <i>l.</i>	equal to	13,333,333 qrs.

Here we see that the commodities taken as net wealth, in 1831, were nearly double those taken in 1792, presuming only 90 millions to be taken at the first named period; and if we suppose 100 millions to have been taken, then above double. During the war, the portion taken by Government increased from, say 6½ to 18, and, since the war, it has decreased from 18 to 14. The amount taken by individuals was, it should appear, a little reduced during the war; but, since that time, it has been raised from, say 7½ to 13½! Again,

	Primary labourers.		qrs.	b.
In 1792	7,200,000 furnished	14,545,454 qrs.	or	2 0 each*
In 1813	8,257,144 furnished	25,833,333 qrs.	or	3 1 ”
In 1831	9,925,793 furnished	27,272,727 qrs.	or	2 6 ”
Or if	9,925,793 furnished	30,308,030 qrs.	3	0½ ”

Thus, although the quantities of commodities furnished, increased from 25,833,333, in 1813, to possibly 30,308,030, in 1831, the increase in the numbers of the primary producers reduced the average of each individual contribution half a bushel, or about 2 per cent.; and yet it is commonly said and believed, that the increase in the numbers of the labouring class is injurious, and they are stimulated to leave the country. These comparative exhibitions, though not strictly accurate, throw a strong light on what was really taking place in the country at the time.—*Hopkins's Great Britain for the Last Forty Years.*

\* This is per head, including children. A family of six persons would furnish twelve quarters, and so on.

## SIR EDWARD KNATCHBULL'S NEW BILL FOR REGULATING THE BEER HOUSES.

ON Friday, the 16th, the first order of the day was for the second reading of a Bill, brought in by Sir Edward Knatchbull, for remedying the abuses connected with what are called the beer shops, in various parts of the country. The evil it seeks to remedy, namely, the habitual drunkenness, gambling, and vice, of almost every description, of which these beer-houses have become the resort in almost all parts of the country, is matter of such notoriety, that few venture to dispute it; and accordingly petitions from all quarters have succeeded each other to the House, praying for some remedy. The remedy which Sir Edward Knatchbull proposes by his Bill is, first, to make the licence for the sale of beer be dependent on the certificate of six householders rated at 10*l* a-year, in favour of the individual to whom the licence is granted; and next, in preventing the consumption of the beer on the premises, or in any place belonging to the owner of the same house, within a hundred yards of the spot, to prevent evasion.

Sir Edward introduced his bill with a clear explanation of his views. Mr. Fysche Palmer, of Reading, opposed it, and moved that it should be read a second time that day six months. Mr. Warburton also opposed the bill entirely, as unjust to the poor man, and wholly unjustified by evidence of the existing evil. Lord Howick approved of the Bill, but suggested a modification as to the certificates for licences. Lord Ebrington supported the bill, as called for by public necessity. Sir George Strickland objected to it as an invasion of property, though he wished to see drunkenness suppressed, and thought fermented drinks wholly unnecessary. Major Handley opposed the bill, as being intended to renew the old monopoly of the brewers. He thought that the more easily spirits and other strong drinks could be procured, the less would people use them to excess, and instanced Spain and Portugal. He thought frequent changes so disadvantageous that he should prefer even bad laws if they were fixed, to good ones subject to constant mutation.

Mr. Buckingham replied to the arguments of Mr. Palmer, Mr. Warburton, Sir George Strickland, and Major Handley. Lord Sandon gave an account of the great increase of drunkenness in Liverpool. Lord Granville Somerset, Sir Charles Burrell, and Mr. A. Daring, all bore testimony to the increasing demoralization of the population in the rural districts, by drunkenness and other vices, flowing from the same source: and Colonel Williams, and Mr. Lloyd showed that the same evils were as rapidly increasing in the manufacturing towns. Mr. Roebuck opposed the bill, as not calculated to cure the evil, and as passing by the rich keeper of the larger public house, and fastening

new member for Wells, who was in the former Parliament when the old beer bill was passed, admitted that it had produced great evil instead of good, though a contrary result had been anticipated: and Lord Althorp, after enforcing this statement, promised to give his support to the measure, which he was glad had fallen into so good hands. Our own views on the subject are so fully developed in the speech delivered in reply to the several speakers named, that we give it, as reported in the *Mirror of Parliament*, as we have already done the one on Triennial Parliaments, in lieu of an article on the subject. The speech is as follows:

Mr. BUCKINGHAM—Sir, if this were a question between the monopoly of the brewers and a free trade in beer, I should not hesitate to give my entire support to the latter. If it were a question between the sale of ardent spirits and the consumption of malt liquor, I should also give the preference to the last, as being the least noxious of the two. But it is a question between public convenience and public morality; and I cannot, therefore, for a moment hesitate as to which I should give my support. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Reading (Mr. Palmer) eulogized the present system of multiplied beer shops, by saying that they afforded, in their warm fires and pleasant beverage, a great comfort and relief to the labouring man: that was his description of their benefits. Sir, I heard this with as much pain as surprise, for it indicates a low tone of morality indeed, and a lamentable degree of selfishness in the labouring population of England, if their enjoyments are made to consist mainly of a comfort and relief of which they alone are the partakers, and of which their wives and families do not participate in the slightest degree. Nay, not only do they not participate in the supposed pleasure, but they are greatly injured by it; first, by the absence of the husband and father from his natural home, and next, by the expenditure of that which would make the home a scene of comfort to all, in the wasteful and useless dissipation of the beer house. (Hear.) If there were no other argument than this against the present system—that it drew husbands away from their wives, and fathers from their children, and made their homes comfortless by an expenditure, of what belonged to all for the selfish enjoyment of one only among the number—I should deem this conclusive, and should therefore hail any measure which had a tendency to correct so great an evil. (Hear, hear.)

The advocates of the present system, who defend it on the ground of its affording increased comforts to the poor, ought, I think, to have shown, first, that the beer now supplied for their use is either better in quality, or cheaper in price, than that furnished by the larger public houses before these smaller beer shops were established. They have not even attempted it, and if they had they would have failed; for it is notorious that it is the same great brewers generally who furnish the beer, as no small brewers can successfully compete with them, from the vast advantage which large capital affords to that process; and that the quality is not improved, or the price diminished, in the slightest degree. To be sure, the hon. member for Bridport (Mr. Warburton), was facetious enough in his endeavour to show that the two complaints made against the beer shops—first, that the beer was bad in quality, and, secondly, that men got drunk upon it—were incompatible with each other, and could not both be true. But with all deference to the much greater experience of that hon. gentleman, I must say, that I can readily believe them both. It is by no means necessary that an intoxicating drink should be good, to ensure its consumption in large quantities; and many hon. members who hear me, will, no doubt, readily admit that the very worst wines find ample consumers; and that they often produce intoxication in a greater degree than wines of a better quality. Indeed my own experience would induce me to say that they who are most choice in the excellent quality of their wines, are generally most temperate in the use of them; while to the hard drinker, nothing that is strong, fiery, and intoxicating, comes amiss. (Hear, hear.) The beer may, therefore, be very bad; and yet there may be great tipping and much intoxication from it nevertheless.

I was somewhat amused by the sensation of surprise created by the observa-

tion of the hon. Baronet, one of the members for Yorkshire (Sir George Strickland), when he asserted that he did not think fermented drinks of any kind at all necessary for health or comfort. It was a bold assertion, no doubt, to make in a country where beer appears to be considered one of the indispensable necessities of life, where even the domestic servants seem to think that if the beer barrel is exhausted, nature cannot be sustained, unless it be speedily replenished. But it has been my lot to reside for many years in countries where millions of people exist who neither use, nor are even acquainted with the existence of any fermented drinks whatever; yet who, for personal beauty, vigour, strength, health, and activity, far surpass the drunken portion of the population of our own country. But the present bill does not go to deprive any man of the use of beer as a beverage if he wishes to have it. It merely seeks to prevent those congregational meetings, for the more purpose of drinking to excess, which the multiplication of these beer-shops has so much increased. If beer be really a necessary of life, and is so deemed by the labourer, he will surely account it no hardship to be obliged to send for it, as for any other article of domestic consumption, and take it home to his own fire-side, where the presence of his wife and his children may add to his enjoyment. If he will not take this trouble, but values it only when drank away from his home, then is it not a necessary of life to him, nor ought to be deemed a hardship to place it under the restrictions proposed. (Hear, hear.)

Great stress has been laid by the honourable baronet before alluded to (Sir George Strickland), on the destruction of property which this bill will create, and it is said, that after having three years ago encouraged the establishment of these beer-houses, it was too much to turn round so soon upon the parties, and annihilate the property thus embarked. But surely this is altogether a groundless apprehension. The property embarked is not to be touched, the sale of beer need not indeed be at all diminished, as far as its useful and wholesome consumption is concerned, for to all by whom it is sufficiently valued to be worth the taking to their own houses to drink, it will still be as accessible as ever. But if, by its consumption on the premises, drunkenness is encouraged, and vices of various other kinds promoted, and it is well known that these beer-shops in remote districts are the nests of immorality in many shapes; if the peace of society, the happiness of families, and the morals of the rising generation be destroyed; if it is attaching much too high importance to the rights of property to set these in opposition to their reform. When the law permitting these beer shops to be established was first passed, it was done under the hope that good, and not evil, would be the result; and under the tacit and implied condition annexed to the passing of every law, that it shall endure as long as public opinion shall approve, and as it may be found to be not incompatible with the public weal. But the moment that a greater mass of evil consequences are proved to result from the continuance of a law than of good, from that moment it becomes the duty of the legislature to apply a remedy to the evil; and even if some sacrifices of property were involved in the change, (and it is difficult to imagine any improvement to be made by change in the law, which must not involve some such sacrifices), the great and paramount interests of the health, the peace, and the morality of a nation, all of which are invaded by the present system, are of much higher moment even than the rights of property, though I think the one may be preserved without any essential violation of the other. One hon. gentleman indeed, the member for Boston (Major Handley) has so strong an objection to change, that he thinks even bad laws when fixed are better than good ones liable to perpetual mutation; but though change without improvement is undoubtedly an evil; and though the rights of property ought to be respected, yet, believing that the changes proposed by this Bill, will be a great improvement on the one it seeks to supersede, believing that the rights of property will not be violated, and that public morality will be greatly promoted by its passing into a law, I shall give my hearty and cordial support to its being now read a second time. (Hear, hear, hear.)

At the close of the debate, a division was called for, when the numbers appeared, For the Bill, 157; Against it, 27. Though the minority was so small, the parties themselves omitted to take their own names, and therefore there will probably be no list published. It

included, however, all who had spoken against the bill, except Mr. Roebuck, who did not concur in the going to a division, and therefore remained in with those who voted for the second reading.

Since this debate occurred, we have seen the *Examiner*, which selects two of the arguments used by us in favour of this bill, and gives them to its readers as "specimens of the arrant nonsense which men talk about the beer-shops." One of these arguments is that which says that "if beer were really a necessary of life, the consumer would not feel it a hardship to send for it as for his other consumable necessities, and use it at his own home," on which we are advised to try the experiment of sending for our own beer a couple of miles to try the relish of it, and it is then asked, "But who thinks of the taste of the poor. What matters it whether they drink their beer fresh or flat as ditch water?" This may be very witty, but it is neither generous nor just. The Editor of the *Examiner* ought to know, and does know, that we are as much the friends of the poor as he himself can claim to be; and we venture to hold the opinion, that our efforts to promote habits of temperance; and order, and domestic enjoyment, among the labouring population, whether married or unmarried—for if labouring men have not all wives, they have relatives, or friends, or acquaintances, whose society might be enjoyed without intoxication—are acts of quite as true friendship to them as the jeers of the *Examiner* towards their equally sincere advocates, and the indirect encouragement given them to frequent those beer-houses, in which so many have found their ruin.

What may be the motives of the *Examiner* for its not unfrequent attacks of this description, it would be difficult for us to divine. But this at least we can say, that we shall never retort upon it by any similar conduct; being too strongly sensible of the want of generosity and justice in its own conduct towards us, to retaliate in a similar strain. The friends of liberal principles, among whom the *Examiner* has so long taken a deservedly distinguished lead—and among whom also we venture to class ourselves, as of quite as long, and we hope, quite as high standing as the *Examiner* itself, for our advocacy of freedom is not a thing of to-day, nor has it been without heavy penalties and sacrifices—ought to have more regard for their cause, and more respect for its supporters, than wantonly to endeavour to decry each other. There is ample room and verge enough for all, without our trampling on each other, and this, at least, we will never do.

#### CONSEQUENCES OF A FORCED RISE OF WAGES.

In England, the operatives execute in a given time, say a week or a month, a much greater quantity of work than the operatives of the continent; and, in England, coal, and iron, canals, railroads, coasts, harbours, and geographical position, give to the manufacturer a most decided superiority in supplying the foreign market with manufactured goods. Yet, notwithstanding all these peculiar advantages which he possesses, the English manufacturer is so nearly undersold by the foreigner, that any material advance in the real wages of the operative classes, would disable him from encountering the competition to which he is exposed; and, if rendered compulsory, either by an act of the Legislature, or, by combination among the working people, would destroy manufacturing profits, and transfer the seats of manufacturing industry to other countries.—Colonel Torrens.

## MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS OF PARLIAMENT DURING THE WEEK.

---

On Wednesday, May 14, the whole of the evening sitting, up to one o'clock in the morning, was occupied with the discussion of the first clause of the Poor Law Amendment Bill, which, after several trifling amendments, was carried without a division, though not without opposition from several speakers, particularly Sir James Scarlett, Lord Granville Somerset, Colonel Evans, and Sir Henry Willoughby. At one o'clock a motion was made to adjourn the debate, as the lateness of the hour was unfavourable to calm and careful deliberation; but it was resisted by Ministers and a very large majority; and the House ultimately sat till three o'clock in the morning, though, at this late or early hour, many of the few Members remaining in the House were asleep, and the other half incapacitated, by weariness and fatigue, from judging clearly and distinctly of the propositions on which they had to vote. Such hours and such scenes as these, and the resistance to every proposal for their amendment, are disgraceful to the House, and deeply injurious to the country.

On Thursday, the 15th, Mr. Lloyd obtained leave to bring in a Bill for amending the law relating to arson, or wilful burning, founded on the principle, that offences against property merely, ought not to be punished as offences against life.

On the same evening, Mr. Pollock gave notice of his intention to bring in a Bill to abolish arrest for debt—to apply to all debts contracted after the present year.

New writs were moved for Edinburgh, in the room of Mr. Francis Jeffrey, who has been appointed one of the Scotch Judges; for Leith, in the room of Mr. J. A. Murray, who has accepted Mr. Jeffrey's office of Lord Advocate of Scotland; and for North Derby, in the room of Lord Cavendish, now become Earl of Burlington.

The discussion on Mr. Tennyson's motion for leave to bring in a Bill to shorten the duration of Parliaments, occupied the remainder of the night till twelve o'clock: of the history of which we have given a report elsewhere.

After its termination, Mr. Littleton brought in a Bill called the Irish Church Temporalities Amendment Act: Mr. Jervis obtained leave to bring in a Bill to regulate the admission of freemen in Municipal Corporations; and Mr. Cooper obtained leave to bring in a Bill respecting appeals to Quarter Sessions in Ireland.

After midnight considerably, Mr. Halcomb moved for a Committee to inquire into the state of the harbours on the coast of Kent and Sussex; but after discoursing for some time on the subject, on the question being put to a division, he was the only person who said "Aye;" and being therefore directed by the Speaker in the usual way



—"The Ayes must go forth"—there was no one to accompany him; nor any other to assist him as Teller; so that the division, which is, we believe, quite unparalleled in Parliamentary history, stood thus in the Votes of the House:—"Ayes *None*; Noes 89;" for as the Tellers are not included in the House Divisions—Mr. Halcomb himself, the only "Aye" on the question, being the Teller, counted for nothing, and was therefore in this respect literally a cipher.

On Friday, the 16th, the Beer Act Amendment Bill was read a second time on the motion of Sir Edward Knatchbull; and of the discussion on that question we have also given a history in another place.

After it was terminated, Mr. John Parker moved for a Committee to consider of the claims of certain merchants who had suffered great loss by confiscations of their property in debts due to them in Denmark on the occasion of the last Danish war; for which they claimed restitution, on the ground that the Crown had become possessed of a large amount of Danish property seized in England, from which these claims ought to be paid. Notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, and the noise and confusion from persons leaving the House after the division on the Beer Bill had terminated, Mr. Parker stated his case with great distinctness; and placed the facts in so clear a light that no one could misunderstand them. As, however, the subject was discussed last Session on a petition, and nearly all the Members who remained to support his motion for a Committee, if it went to a division, had previously made themselves well acquainted with it beforehand, it had not the attraction of novelty, nor that of an anticipated debate. Mr. Parker did full justice to his case, however, in his mode of stating it: and its own merits secured the rest.

The motion was seconded by Sir John Rae Reid, one of the Members for Dover, and a wealthy merchant of the City, who, in true mercantile phraseology, stated that "in this question he represented 6000*l.*," a constituency that would have been well understood on the Stock Exchange, but was somewhat new to hear of in the House of Commons at least.

The motion was supported by Lord Sandon, Mr. Warburton, Mr. Buckingham, Sir George Strickland, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. G. W. Wood, Mr. Sheppard, Mr. Baines, and Mr. Ruthven; and no one having attempted to dispute the justice of the claims, Lord Althorp said that he should yield to the sense of the House on the subject; and if Mr. Parker would withdraw his motion for a Committee, the Government would undertake to have the claims investigated, and such of them as were well substantiated, paid. This result appeared to give great satisfaction to all parties, and the motion for the Committee was withdrawn accordingly.

Mr. Lynch then rose to bring forward his motion for a Committee to inquire into the state of the Court of Chancery; but the House had become so thin, that Mr. O'Connell urged him not to proceed with his motion now. He persisted in so doing, however, and continued speaking for about an hour, by which time a great many other Members had left; and ultimately the number being reduced to thirty-five, it was counted out at eleven o'clock; and the House adjourned over the Whitsun holidays till Wednesday.

## CONFIDENTIAL LETTER OF LORD ANGLESEA TO HIS COLLEAGUES ON THE STATE OF IRELAND.

[The following Letter was placed in our hands, in manuscript, on the night of the debate on the Irish Tithe Bill, in the House of Commons, when Mr. Ronayne read portions of it in his speech. Some doubt was then expressed of its authenticity, and therefore we did not publish it while that doubt remained. Lord Grey having subsequently admitted, however, that the Letter was genuine, we give it a place in our pages, as forming a valuable piece of secret though authentic history, and highly honourable to the noble writer himself; though it is to be regretted that his colleagues of the Cabinet, to whom it was addressed, did not act more in unison with the advice it contains.]

"Foreseeing that the affairs of Ireland must occupy an important share of the earliest deliberations of a reformed House of Commons, I take the occasion of my colleagues' again assembling, to impress on their attention the subject of a letter addressed by me to Lord Grey on the 1st of August last. That letter was a repetition of the suggestions which I felt it my duty to make at different periods for many months preceding, in reference to some large measures of justice towards this country.

"Every day's experience during that period, and still more since the date of that latter, strengthens the views which I then submitted, and shows more clearly the necessity of such concessions, as well as the danger of their further delay. I at once concede to my colleagues the magnitude of the obstructions to their benevolent intentions in respect to Ireland; but while I admit that its state is the chief amongst the difficulties, I maintain that its relief is the first duty of Government. For some, though not for all, of the essentials in that relief, I beg leave to refer to my letter above mentioned, containing a list of measures I proposed, from which, with the important exception of the Processions' Bill, little deduction has since been made.

"First and foremost in importance, and in its immediate pressure, is the question of reform in the Protestant Church of Ireland. This establishment, which at all times far exceeded the religious wants of the Protestant congregations, has hitherto been upheld by the State, mainly on the ground that it served the temporal use of consolidating the connexion of the two countries. But this service it no longer performs. Instead of strengthening the connexion, it weakens it. Any Government henceforth pledged to maintain that Establishment, as it now exists, must be brought into constant and permanent collision with public opinion, and the prejudices and passions of the Irish people. However attached myself to the doctrines of the Protestant Church, and however anxious to discountenance any violent changes in its temporal condition, it is impossible for me not to see that the prevailing resistance to its legal pecuniary claims is only symptomatic of a deep-rooted and wide-spread conviction in the minds of the Irish community, that the continuance of this Establishment in its present extent and splendour is no longer justified by the condition of this country; and that the time has arrived for such just and practicable reforms in respect of it as may eventually place at the disposal of the State a national fund to be applied to necessary national purposes.

"Such I have been reluctantly compelled to feel, is the general and unchangeable opinion of the Irish people upon this subject; and I am equally impressed with the apprehension, that unless the Parliament takes the lead in the work of now inevitable innovation, the recent confederacy against tithes will prove to have been only the first of a series of deplorable struggles between the Government and the national antipathies; that every day during which those struggles are protracted the Government will find itself less in a condition of imposing its own terms, and that sooner or later the final result must be, an extorted and undignified compliance with demands which we had not the foresight (or rather, pre-

haps, the power) to concede. I have already submitted to the Cabinet the outlines of a plan of such modifications in the church property of Ireland as the exigencies of the times appeared to me to require:

"By that plan, to which at present I need only generally refer, the exasperating qualities of tithes as an impost exacted from the Catholic occupant are avoided, and the fund itself made available for important national objects; while, by the suggested improvements in the management of the church lands, the Protestant clergy would be secured in the enjoyment of their existing incomes, subject only to deductions little exceeding the present costs of collection. That plan contemplated no diminution of the numbers of the Protestant hierarchy, and if offered in time, would, I am convinced, have satisfied the church and the public. Whether it still would satisfy the latter, I consider to be very doubtful. This has proved to be one of those questions upon which the public mind, when once powerfully excited, is never stationary. The daily discussions of it, both here and in England, have so impressed upon all classes the necessity of extensive changes, and the reasonableness and the practicability of rendering those changes beneficial to the public at large, that I begin to question whether it now can be safely insisted upon, under any modification of the Irish church, that its members should be permanently continued in their present numbers. On the contrary, a strong impression has been forged upon me, that no measure of adjustment, however satisfactory in other respects, will perfectly meet the emergency which does not include such a gradual reduction of superfluous members as shall finally bring down the numbers of its dignitaries and officiating ministers to a scale commensurate with the religious wants of the Protestant community. It is not in a spirit of rash innovation, but because I have fully the fear of events before my eyes, that I can bring myself thus early to familiarize my mind to the expediency of appeasing the national demands by some such timely provision as, without violating the rights of existing incumbents, would ultimately secure, by pacific means, a reduction far from adverse to the true interests of religion, and holding out the prospect, at no distant day, of a separate fund to alleviate the burden of a system of poor laws.

"But to whatever extent it may be found wise or possible that a Church reform ought to be attempted, I cannot too earnestly impress upon the Cabinet, as a matter vitally affecting the public peace of Ireland, that no permanent diminution of agitation and discontent can be expected until it be announced that some reform in the establishment is meditated. I cannot permit myself to be lulled into security by any partial abatement of resistance to the payment of tithes. I consider this abatement (such as it is) to be merely temporary, and to be attributable in part to the formidable attitude assumed by the Government to vindicate the law as it now stands—in part to the prosecutions instituted—in part to the intervening excitement of the coming elections, and perhaps still more than to any other cause, to the general expectation that the popular warning, so distinctly and loudly given, will not be lost upon the Government and the Legislature. The present comparative suspension of violence affords us breathing-time, and it is for us to profit by it. If we count upon it as lasting, we shall, I fear, too soon discover that we obtained a truce, not a victory. Among the other measures of relief to Ireland suggested in the letter referred to were—grand and petty jury bills, poor laws, labour-rates, processions' bill, special constables' bill, constabulary bill, arms and gunpowder bill, and payment of the Catholic church. A detailed consideration of these several topics would far exceed the limits of the present or any single communication, but I cannot even thus incidentally refer to the last without observing that a state provision for the Catholic clergy, accompanied by an extensive reform in the establishment at Maynooth, appears to me to rank perhaps next in importance to the adjustment of the Protestant church. I shall be prepared at any time to furnish the necessary details upon the subject, and feel assured that they will be found to justify my own conviction that the present dependent state of the Catholic church, and the actual character and temper of its priesthood, resulting from the original defects in the college of Maynooth, are prominent amongst the concurring causes which diffuse through this country a spirit of disquiet and distrust in the authorities, and which, if not removed, threaten before long to leave the King's Government in Ireland without any

party but the King's troops. While I urge thus distinctly upon the Ministry the pressing claims of this country to their prompt interposition, they will not mistake the tone of earnestness for that of complaint. I do not forget that it was the chief calamity of the present Government to have received Ireland from other hands, suffering and agitated as it has since continued; nor when I advert to the events of its history can I altogether dismiss the impression that some such ordeal of agitation as we have witnessed was inevitable. The paramount importance of Catholic Emancipation had so absorbed the attention of the nation as to leave it little time for exploring its other grievances. That great measure was at length passed, but coupled with a fatal admission that it was a surrender to force, not a concession to justice. This produced its full deleterious effect in Ireland; and when we came into office we found her popular leaders seeing very clearly that much remained to be redressed, but animated by a seditious confidence in the efficacy of clamorous demands and threats of physical force for the attainment of even justifiable objects. This spirit was in fierce operation when I arrived, at the close of the year 1830, to resume the government of Ireland. I found at my command a summary law to repress the abuse of popular privileges, and I unhesitatingly applied it. The foremost agitator of the country was successfully prosecuted, and the spell of his influence for the moment dissolved. If he ultimately escaped, it was through the accidental expiration of the law to which he had been made amenable. Neither that nor any similar restrictive law has been renewed; and I cannot regret that ample time should be given to the experiment of governing the country (however difficult the task) by no methods but the enforcement of the ordinary laws. The experiment may prove to be a failure, and new powers be required for the preservation of the daily peace, but should such be the event, I greatly fear that it will be because we shall be found to have overlooked, in the licentious exhibitions of the national discontent, the proper remedies for the evils from which it springs; because, even now while I write—and the Irish people are calling too vehemently, I admit, for healing measures—I am unable to answer them by any other law than the Riot Act upon the point of the bayonet.

"I have thus laid before my colleagues, in the spirit of confidential sincerity to which they are entitled, an outline of my views on the present position of affairs in Ireland. I do so, however, bearing fully in my recollection the nature and extent of the difficulties against which they may have to contend; I see the possibility of an *intractable* House of Commons; I am aware of the composition of the House of Lords; I know that the times have passed when the will of the Minister could determine the acts of the Legislature; still I cannot refrain from urging upon the attention of my colleagues the claims of this suffering and too long neglected country to a participation in the benefit of that enlightened policy which has already conferred so much upon other parts of the empire.

"Phoenix Park, Oct. 9, 1833.

"ANGLESEY."

#### NO RELIEF EQUAL TO THE ABOLITION OF THE CORN LAWS.

No measures for increasing the reward of labour can be successful, until the Corn Laws have been first abolished. Benevolent individuals, inattentive to the paralyzing influence of these laws, have sought to improve the condition of the people by limiting the supply, and thereby increasing the value of labour; and with this view, have at one time recommended, that the labouring classes should reduce their numbers by a prudential abstinence from marriage; and at another time, have urged them to obtain, either by Legislative enactment, or by combinations amongst themselves, a limitation of the hours of labour. Either of these modes of diminishing the supply of labour in the market, might have the effect of raising real wages, provided the natural and acquired superiority which England possesses in manufacturing industry, were not counteracted by the high comparative value of food. But while the Corn Laws continued to keep up the value of food, and to place us, in the foreign market, on the verge of equality with our continental competitors, neither these, nor any other conceivable measures, can have the effect of improving the condition of the operative classes.—  
*Colonel Torrens.*

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR.

## OPINIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF FUNDED PROPERTY AND CURRENCY.

[As the writer of the following letter appears to quote sentiments and language to which we have no recollection of having ever given utterance, we apprehend he must be alluding to some speech reported in our pages, spoken by some other Member, or to some letter addressed to us by a Correspondent. We may take this opportunity, therefore, once for all to say, that we do not hold ourselves responsible either for the speeches of other Members, or the sentiments of Correspondents; each of which must stand or fall by their own merits. In this spirit we give the following letter, which will find among our readers most probably both advocates and opponents.]—*Edmon.*

SIR,

*Birmingham, April, 1834.*

IN listening to you, when speaking of the funds, it might be supposed that stockholders were wholly unprotected by the law, or hold their property merely by sufferance, and might be justly despoiled whenever the Legislature thought proper or found it convenient! You, Sir, are represented to have expressed yourself thus: "The true principle is, that when the funds reach a certain price, the premium arising should go to the benefit of the public;" and again you are made to say, "The fairest way would be to regulate this interest by the price of corn." But is there any principle more universally admitted in all civilized communities, than that "the fairest way" to act on all occasions, is to abide by the clearly expressed terms of every agreement made without fraudulent intention? And will not every deviation from such agreement subject the delinquent, not only to the censure of the law, but to the scorn and contempt of every honest man. But if such conduct would be deemed highly disgraceful even in the conduct of a common tradesman, how much more so ought it to appear in the conduct of a legislator! And must it not, therefore, necessarily be supposed, that all the propositions which have been made, or which are intended to be made, with design of depriving the stockholder of any part of his property, have been made in consequence of those who make such propositions being acquainted with the terms on which loans are made, or with the agreement which subsists between the public and the stockholder? I therefore take leave to request, that previous to their making any more motions or observations on the subject, they will take the trouble to look into the work entitled, "The Statutes at Large," for the laws by which the funds were first established, which will be found to contain the following clause, viz.: "All the said several annuities shall be and are hereby exempted from any taxes, rates, assessments, or impositions whatsoever!" and the necessity for such a clause will appear evident on the least consideration: for what man in his senses would ever lend money to a borrower who retained the right of altering the stipulated terms on which the money was lent, at his pleasure? If the Legislature had retained the right of imposing a tax of any kind on the funds, the stockholder's right of property would have been completely annihilated. He would have had no better security than if he had lived under the most arbitrary or despotic government on the face of the earth, where property depends entirely on the good pleasure of the aristocrat or law-maker. The stockholder goes into the stock-market and makes his purchase with the same confidence in the law, and is equally protected by the law as it now stands, as purchasers of all descriptions go to the corn-market, meat-market, or any other market; and I appeal to every man of integrity, whether in any of the latter cases, they would deem the Legislature justified in making a tax to alter the terms on which the purchases had been made? and if not in the latter case, how could they be justified in making a law to alter the terms on which the stocks were purchased?

The supposed depreciation of the Currency at the time the purchase was made is the reason assigned for the measures proposed; but such a circumstance could not invalidate a positive contract in the smallest degree, even if it had occurred, and that it had been true, as is supposed, that the stockholder had derived any advantage from it; but the case will appear to have been directly the reverse. In the year 1798, the price of consols was only 47½; but as soon as the Bank Indemnity Bill began to operate, and the Land Tax to be redeemed, the price of

stock began to rise, and continued to advance so much, that the average price from its enactment to the end of the war was upwards of 61*l*., so that the stockholders paid at the rate of 33 per cent. more for the annuities they purchased, than if the bill had never existed.\* But *their* loss and the advantage of the public will appear still more evident, by comparing the price of stock during the late wars, with the price of the same stock during the first war with the United States. During that war, the price of consols fell from 80 to 52*l*.; but during the last fourteen years of the late wars, the price of consols rose from 47 to 70; and the actual price, at the conclusion of the last war, was upwards of 30 per cent. higher than at the conclusion of the first American war, although it had not lasted above one-third of the time; which shows clearly that the public derived great advantage from the Indemnity Bill, and that great loss was sustained by those who purchased with the supposed depreciated currency, and fully displays the truth of Adam Smith's assertion—that the value of the currency at the time a purchase is made is of no sort of consequence in regard to the annuity, as the sum paid will always be proportioned to that value, or to the relative amounts of the sum of money ready to be lent, and of the sum of money that is to be raised by sale of annuities, or by borrowing. The value of money, like that of every other commodity, depends entirely on the amount of the demand compared with that of the supply, and in purchasing stock, land, houses, or mortgages, the sum paid will be more or less in proportion to the value of money at the time the purchase is made, and it is evident, therefore, that the stockholders gained nothing by the supposed depreciation.

Thus it appears, that all the statements of the pretended equalizers are wholly inconsistent with truth, and their arguments will appear quite as inconsistent with reason and justice, as their statements are with the truth. If it were just, as they pretend, for Government to deprive the stockholder of the advantage he might derive from a rise in the price of stock, would not the stockholder have an equally just claim on Government to be indemnified for any loss he might sustain by a fall in the price of stock? If it were consistent with reason or justice, to reduce the interest on stock purchased with a depreciated currency, would not equal justice require that the interest paid in a depreciated currency on stock purchased previous to the depreciation, should be increased? One-half the debt now existing was contracted previous to the enactment of the Indemnity Bill; and would not all the holders of stock previous to the year 1797, have had quite as equitable a claim on the public for an increase of interest as the public could have upon those who purchased since then, for a reduction of either capital or of interest?

But if any alteration in the value of the currency could warrant, as has been asserted, an alteration in the terms of an agreement, and if, as it has been said, the value of the currency is to be estimated by the price of bread corn, it will appear that the old stockholders have had an *equitable* claim to compensation ever since the year 1792, as well as during the operation of the Indemnity Bill. The average price of wheat during the ten years which ended with the year 1792, was only 46*s*. a quarter; but the average price for the ten years which ended with the year 1812 was 88*s*. a quarter; and during the ten years that ended with the year 1832, the average price of a quarter of wheat was still as high as 64*s*. a quarter; being an advance of thirty-six per cent. upon the average price for the ten years which ended with the year 1792; and the advance on animal food is still much greater. Up to the year 1793 the price of butter was only eightpence per pound, and the price of butcher's meat was only fourpence per pound; whereas the average price of butter is now thirteen-pence per pound, and the average price of butcher's meat is sevenpence per pound. Thus I and all other old stockholders are now paying thirty-six per cent. more for bread, fifty per cent. more for butter, and seventy-five per cent. more for butcher's meat, than those most essential articles cost us at the time we invested our money in the funds. And must it not therefore be evident that all the attacks which have been made on funded property are made in direct opposition, to every principle of equity as well as of law, by which funded property is expressly exempted from any taxes, rates, assessments, or impositions whatsoever?

WILLIAM ANDERSON.

## INIQUITIES AND COSTS OF THE LAW—ALLEGIANCE DEPENDANT ON PROTECTION.

SIR,

Blackrock, April, 1834.

If allegiance on the part of the subject be a debt due for the protection of the Sovereign, and I am not aware that any despotism claims an allegiance which does not propose protection in return; and if, when protection is *not* extended, allegiance is consequently no longer due; why then, I say, the allegiance due by the subjects of these realms is circumscribed within very narrow bounds.

I am not, and I expect the people of England are not, so wedded to the mere forms of free institutions, as to overlook those things which free institutions were designed to secure; nor is the public any longer to be deceived or amused by mere names, if the substance is to be subducted while the shadow alone remains. A despotism may be a popular rule, when confirmed by the people, and exercised for their benefit; but no tyranny is so intolerable, so multifarious, so untangible, so atrocious, as that which establishes itself on the basis of sacred but *perverted* laws.

Is this, or is this not, the case with the present administration of the laws of these realms? Is the subject protected? Is this even the object, when wealth is the influencing ingredient? No! the subject is *not* protected! The administration of the laws serves little other purpose than as the ladder for unprincipled talent to mount to rank and wealth on the neck of the plundered subject, whom those laws were originally designed to protect, but designed to protect in vain. Never was the truth of our moral poet, and more than poet, our moral philosopher, so fully illustrated—

For forms of governments let fools contest,  
Whate'er is best administered is best—

as in the mockery of justice presented to the needy applicant for redress from our laws.

Some little hope has latterly been held out to us of improvement in this respect: "cheap law" is a commodity promised soon to be in the market; but, if I pay my quota of tax, appointed by the state, why, I ask, is justice to be doled out to me at any price? or why am I to be punished in my purse for endeavouring to put the laws of my country in force against those who have been guilty of a breach of them? We may institute inquiries into the causes of demoralization among the lower classes, but is there no grounds for inquiry into the total deprivation of just feeling among the higher classes on the subject of the administration of our laws? Do those laws afford redress to the injured? or restore the spoil to those who have been plundered? On the contrary, is there not a hedge of thorns placed around the villain who attacks only private property, private character, or the private individual, that no prudent man will attempt a second time to pass? And if even the State become the prosecutor of more conspicuous crime, it is at an expense that stamps with deeper infamy the character of the system.

Yet these are things of every-day occurrence; so gross, so absurd, they excite our laughter; so iniquitous, so universal, that they awaken, on reflection, our execration, our gloomiest apprehensions, and dread. I could fill THE PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW with such instances of the perversion of all that should be sacred in justice, as ought to crimson the cheek of every officer and practitioner in our courts, from the Chancellor on the woolsack to the humblest Attorney in their purities.

But it is unnecessary: the iniquity of the whole system is too glaringly familiar to need any references from me. Nor will lawyers ever cleanse the Augean stable thoroughly; witness O'Connell's Bill to amend the Law of Libel, which precluded the poor man from all redress. The hon. gentleman, I question not, meant well; but the atmosphere of a court of law incapacitates for a clear and unobscured view of pure and perfect justice: its simplicity escapes the microscopic eye alike of minute philosophy or professional technicality. The people, then,

must take the framing of the laws into their own hands, and require them also to be administered for their benefit, and no longer suffer them to serve as a ladder for the ambition of the best, much less, as has been too often the case, for the ambition, cupidity, and avarice of the very worst of men.

If the laws should not be so administered, why then, I say, agreeable to the principle laid down at the commencement of this paper, that when protection is not extended by the Sovereign, allegiance is not due by the subject.

R. T. H.

[We concur entirely in the view taken by our clear-sighted Correspondent; and have contended for years past that justice ought to be within the reach of every living being in the kingdom—without a farthing of cost; and that Arbitrators should be appointed and paid by the State, as the Judges now are; when it being their interest to make justice speedy and certain, all the iniquities of the laws' expense, uncertainty, and delay, would be swept away; as well as the entire machinery, for the sake of whose interests alone these evils are inflicted on the community.—EDITOR.]

### ENUMERATION OF SOME OF THE CAUSES OF DRUNKENNESS AMONG THE LABOURING CLASSES.

SIR,

*Carlisle, April, 1834.*

YOUR notice of a motion to procure an "Inquiry into the causes of habitual Drunkenness among the labouring classes," has excited universal interest in this part of the country. Now, as it is desirable that you should be possessed of every information upon this momentous subject, I hope you will excuse an obscure individual for submitting to your consideration a few important facts, which there is reason to believe are either utterly unknown or entirely overlooked by every member of both Houses of Parliament.

The monstrous and unnatural distinction between man and man, which unhappily prevails throughout the British dominions, has long been a matter of deep regret to every lover of his kind: nor has it escaped the notice of benevolent foreigners, as has been fully evinced by the publications of several late tourists. But no writer on the subject has yet, I believe, regarded this enormous evil as one of the principal causes of excessive drinking among the working community. Such, however, is indubitably the fact, and to it can be easily traced the necessity (if it really exist) for corporal punishment in the army and navy.

The supercilious and haughty demeanour of what are called the "upper ranks" toward them, by whose half-paid labour they are furnished with the comforts and enjoyments of life, is not only insulting and oppressive, but really insufferable. To such a height is this intolerant overhearing carried, and so grievously is it felt by the industrious classes, that thousands among them who would otherwise be sober, industrious, and respectable men, finding that they are treated as beings of an inferior species, lose every idea of self-respect, and recklessly betake themselves to the pernicious practice of drinking. This vile treatment of the labouring classes by *any* of the ranks into which society is mischievously divided, would be sufficiently reprehensible, but when chiefly proceeding, as it actually does, from that class which falls under the description of "tradesmen,"—when the oppressors belong to the very next class in gradation to the oppressed—who are, in many respects, not even their equals, but their inferiors, the grievance is absolutely intolerable, and imperatively calls for speedy and effectual redress. This, be assured, Sir, is one of the principal causes which have covered our land with drunkards, and filled our calendars with crimes of every description that can degrade human nature.

Another powerful cause of intoxication amongst mechanics, &c., arises from that spirit of selfishness which at present forms so dark a spot in our national character. If any workman, however drunk or profligate, be supposed capable of performing six-penny-worth of work in a week more than a sober and orderly person, he is certain of obtaining the preference, though the respectable workman should be utterly destitute of employment, with perhaps a family depending on his exertions. That there are many exceptions to this iniquitous practice, especially in the metropolis, is not denied, but that it forms the general rule of



conduct among provincial employers is a melancholy truth which cannot be refuted. But avarice alone is not the only reason why drunkenness is preferred to sobriety by a great majority of country masters. Many of these men having been brought up in a state of slavery, possess a most tyrannical disposition, and though they are generally illiterate, yet they have understanding enough to know that if their workmen were persons of sobriety and reflection, they would not for an hour submit to the oppression and contumely of which they are now the victims.

Several other causes of national drunkenness might be easily produced, but this letter is already too long, which I regret, and shall therefore mention only one more cause, that might, perhaps, with propriety, be styled the radical source of the evil. In the almost numberless buildings which are continually erecting throughout the kingdom, thousands of men are employed as stone-masons, bricklayers, joiners, plasterers, painters, &c., to nearly all of whom what is called an "allowance" is served but twice, and, in some instances, thrice daily. This allowance is for the most part in ardent spirits, or grog, of which all the apprentices, however young, are of course partakers, though many of those youths would doubtless prefer malt liquor, while a still greater number would gladly receive the amount in money. Thus is there a vast proportion of our population initiated in the baleful habit of drinking at an early period of their existence, so that at the completion of their apprenticeships they enter into the world and join their fellow-workmen as experienced toppers.

Strange! that so palpable a predisposing cause of general drunkenness should have escaped the vigilance of the Temperance Societies, the members of which seem to have no other means in view for accomplishing their object than the influence of example! Abusive will be the hope that rests upon such a sandy foundation. Let those labourers in the vineyard of public morals be assured, that *their* example will effect little in the promotion of sobriety among the labouring classes. Very many of the leading "Temperates" are well known to the working people as their most grievous oppressors, and therefore they will never profit by any precedent, however praiseworthy, which may be set before them by men whom they justly hold in abhorrence. I beg to apologise for the length of this communication, but being an inexperienced writer I could not convey in fewer words the facts to which I respectfully beg leave to solicit your attention.

I am, Sir, with gratitude for your exertions in the cause of the people,

Your very obedient Servant,

A BRITISH PELOOT.

#### 'OBJECTIONS TO THE EXEMPTION OF FATHERS FROM SUPPORTING THEIR ILLEGITIMATE OFFSPRING.'

SIR,

Hexham, May, 1834.

I should be glad to avail myself of the privilege you grant some of your readers, to occupy a page in your REVIEW, with some reflections on one clause of the Bill recently introduced into the House of Commons for the amendment of the Poor Laws. The clause is this:

"That so much of any act or acts of Parliament as enables the mother of any bastard child to charge or affiliate any such child on any person as the reputed or putative father, and to require him to be charged with or contribute to the expenses attending the birth, sustentation, or maintenance of any such child &c., be, and the same is, hereby repealed."

So that one improvement of the existing law is to remove all restraints from the unprincipled and dissolute of our sex, and allow them to seduce, betray, and desert the weaker sex with impunity. But, say the abettors of this most iniquitous clause, this regulation will make women more cautious and circumspect. True; on the same principle that honest inhabitants of houses and shops would be more cautious and circumspect in guarding their premises, if the penalties against burglary were repealed. But would your wealthy citizens approve of such a change of the law on such an argument? Do these Legislators consider how young women are exposed, both in factories and private dwellings, to the designs of men of every class, of every character, and of every age, both equals and superiors, servants and masters, and would they deprive them of the

only protection the law affords a young female of the humbler class, by removing all fear of penalty or punishment, or even exposure, from her seducer? The inevitable consequence will be that the young and inexperienced female will, in numberless situations, be surrounded by persons who will be on the watch to seize, and ever to prepare the weak and unguarded moment, to triumph in the ruin of the comparatively innocent.

That the apprehension of having an illegitimate child to support from their own resources, will operate as a check upon any but the already corrupted and depraved, I should extremely doubt. If natural modesty, strengthened by virtuous principles and dread of shame, will not guard the youthful female, she will not be saved by sordid calculations of profit and loss.

But this amendment of the law, so called, countenances another principle still more abominable—the utter neglect and abdication of a parent's office. Nature proclaims, and Nature's Lord announces, "that he that provideth not for his own, is worse than an infidel"—he is worse even than the brute; for the irrational animals themselves instinctively provide for the female during her retirement, and the young during their helplessness. Surely it will not be argued that the absence of the marriage ceremony divests this first of duties of its sanction, or this most amiable and important instinct of its force! Because a man has succeeded in destroying the reputation and blasting the conjugal prospects of a woman, shall he be at liberty to leave her destitute of necessaries, and expose the unoffending infant to want and wretchedness, and probably an untimely end? By the law of nature a father is equally bound to support an illegitimate as a legitimate child, and with that fundamental law ought the municipal laws of every well-governed state to coincide.

Quid sine moribus  
Leges proficiunt vana?

Expedients of convenience, contrary to good morals and subversive of sound principles, are sure to prove pernicious, to nations as to individuals, in the grand result. Very little political sagacity is sufficient to anticipate consequences the most disastrous from this projected innovation. If the father is to be discharged from the duty of supporting the illegitimate child, why not the mother, and so the child be suffered to perish of want? Or shall the unnatural mother, who exposes her infant, be hanged, and the no less unnatural, and no less guilty father go unreproved? It is a long-established principle in the administration of justice, that it should be equal and impartial. "Cavendum est etiam, ne easdem de causis alii plebantur, alii ne appellentur quidem."

The evil to be remedied by this change of the law, is the liability of the father to the alternative of contribution or imprisonment, on the evidence of the female. I believe the experience of the past establishes the fact, that such evidence, in rural districts at least, is rarely false—rarely, to say the least, as any other class of evidence, upon which culprits are convicted and made liable to much severer punishments. But the delinquent, if he does not produce money or security, is committed—and thus, according to Lord Althorp, "the finest young men in the country" are imprisoned among pickpockets and felons, and demoralized. His lordship surely is not aware that a law exists by which a poacher, if he fails to pay his fine on the instant of his conviction, may be, and frequently is, committed to prison to herd with the same demoralizing society. And yet poachers comprehend some "of the finest young men in the country," in a physical sense, and yet it would seem that the guilt and the social evil of slaying a hare or pheasant, without the leave of the lord of the manor, is not much greater than that of a man seducing and betraying a female, and of a parent deserting his child. But I question whether the poacher would meet with as much sympathy from some of our modern senators who cheered "these fine young men," whom Lord Althorp would let loose to ply their trade of corruption with impunity. But I still hope that there is good feeling enough in the House of Commons, or at least in the House of Lords, to reject such a proposition with contempt and indignation. If not, I am quite sure from what I hear on all sides of me, that the act will be received with the scorn and disgust of all the humane and sober minded portion of the community.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your very obedient servant,

ANTI-DRACO.

# QUESTIONS SENT TO THE SEAPORTS BY THE ADMIRALTY ON THE SUBJECT OF IMPRESSMENT.

SIR,

*South Shields, April 9, 1834.*

I EMBRACE the earliest opportunity of informing you, that a public meeting of seamen was held in the Seamen's Hall of this port, on Friday last, April 4th, when the following answers were unanimously agreed to, as suitable replies to the adjoining questions, which were handed to us for answers by Mr. Thomas Young, of North Shields, on the 27th ult., he having received them with many more questions, of which we cannot learn the particulars, from the Admiralty, signed George Elliot. We immediately printed the questions and circulated them widely, so that during the week which elapsed between their circulation and the meeting for answers, the seamen had ample time to consider them; the answers have been sent to Captain Elliott, the Secretary to the Admiralty, and are in substance the same as those from North Shields. Robert Anderson, Esq., presided at the meeting. At the close of the meeting, which was most numerously attended, and was the first meeting of Seamen assembled in South Shields since you so ably introduced, and advocated their cause against Impressment, in the House of Commons, a vote of thanks, with feelings of genuine gratitude, was proposed, first, to yourself, as the mover, and then to Mr. Young, as the seconder, as well as to all the members who voted with you on that question. This was carried unanimously with loud and long-continued cheering.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

HENRY WOODROFFE,

*Secretary to the Seamen's Association.*

The following are the Questions sent from the Admiralty, in order to ascertain the merchant-seamen's sentiments with regard to Impressment, and the King's service generally.

**Question.** What is the general feeling amongst the merchant-seamen respecting Impressment?

**Answer.** A feeling of horror, it being considered by seamen as unlimited slavery.

**Question.** What are the chief objections made to it?

**Answer.** That the Impressment is into unlimited service, and frequently on the return from a long voyage, without seeing friend or relation, or putting a foot on shore; that the impressed seaman has inadequate pay, and no security or promotion for merit, besides being liable to the capricious punishments to which the seamen were exposed during the last war.

**Question.** Is much importance attached to the King's service giving a title to a pension?

**Answer.** Very great importance is attached by seamen to its giving a title to a pension. We think that for every year a seaman voluntarily serves his country after the period of his limited service is out, he should be entitled to a pension in proportion to the length of his servitude, independently of pensions for wounds or other casualties.

**Question.** Is the power of remitting a portion of a man's pay to his family considered to be a great benefit?

**Answer.** Yes; most certainly, a very great benefit.

**Question.** Does a fear of corporal punishment operate much upon those who have not been in the King's service?

**Answer.** Yes; from the information they get from old warriors or men-of-war's men of last war.

**Question.** Does a fear of such punishment operate upon men of good character who have been in the King's service?

**Answer.** Yes; it being often used at the caprice of a subaltern, and in momentary anger; while if a pause of 24 hours were to take place, between the fault and the punishment, nine out of ten cases, would, upon mature consideration, be forgiven as mere oversights of no great consequence.





